

ILLINOIS CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOLUME V

OCTOBER, 1922

NUMBER 2

PUBLISHED BY

THE ILLINOIS CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

CHICAGO, ILL.

CONTENTS

ALONG THE HISTORIC ILLINOIS	<i>Joseph J. Thompson</i>	99
DISTORTING AMERICAN HISTORY	<i>James M. Graham</i>	114
THE ILLINOIS PART OF THE DIOCESE OF VINCENNES	<i>Joseph J. Thompson</i>	137
POINTS IN ILLINOIS HISTORY—A SYMPOSIUM	<i>Edward Joseph Fortier</i>	143
ILLINOIS' FIRST CITIZEN—PIERRE GIBAULT	<i>Joseph J. Thompson</i>	154
COLONEL RICHARD O'SULLIVAN BURKE	<i>Eugene F. O'Riordan</i>	169
EDITORIAL COMMENT - - - - -		181
BOOK REVIEWS - - - - -		186
MISCELLANY - - - - -		191

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Illinois Catholic Historical Review

VOLUME V

OCTOBER, 1922

NUMBER 2

ALONG THE HISTORIC ILLINOIS

(Continued from July, 1922)

What occurred along the Illinois river between Easter Sunday of 1675 and the first days in May, 1677, no man knows, but at the latter time another Jesuit missionary, the renowned Claude Jean Allouez, came by direction of his superior as the successor to Father Marquette, and was the dominating personality of Illinois and the lake region for a dozen years thereafter. Thanks to Father Allouez we are able again to take up the historical thread of the Illinois and follow its course to more settled times.

Father Allouez was one of the greatest of the Jesuit Indian missionaries. Indeed, he is frequently spoken of as the Francis Xavier of the American missions. It was said of him that "no distance was too great, no danger too threatening to make him desist from his pursuit of the souls of the red men," and "he is credited with having instructed during his apostolic career 100,000 natives, 10,000 of whom he baptized."¹

REV. CLAUDE JEAN ALLOUEZ, S. J.

Allouez was born at St. Didier in France, June 6, 1622, and was 17 years old when he entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus at Toulouse. There and at Billom and Rodez he made his studies. At age 36 he set out for Canada, sailing on the same ship with d'Argenson, who had been made governor of New France.² Like almost all the

¹ Campbell, *Pioneer Priests of North America*, Vol. 3, p. 164.

² *Id.*, p. 147.

other missionaries he was first engaged at posts along the St. Lawrence. In 1660 he was superior at Three Rivers, and while at that post was named Vicar-General of the Northwest, an appointment which was perhaps the first act of the ecclesiastical organization of the Western country. From 1664 to 1676 Father Allouez made incredible journeys over lake Superior and through the territory that afterwards became Wisconsin and Michigan, but by that date had constituted DePere, in what is now Wisconsin, his chief mission. His activities from this date are well summarized by Father Campbell, as follows:

“De Pere was the center of Father Allouez’s work until the news came that Marquette had succumbed to the labor entailed by his journey down the Mississippi, and had died after attempting to inaugurate a mission among the Illinois. ‘A successor was needed,’ says the ‘Relation,’ ‘no less zealous than Marquette,’ and Allouez was ordered to the front. It was at the close of October, 1676, that he set out with two men to go to the country assigned to him, and which he already knew, but the winter was early that year, and they were compelled to go into a camp until the ice was strong enough to bear them. It was not until the month of February that he was able to resume his journey, and then, says he, ‘the mode of navigation was very unusual. Instead of putting the canoe in the water, we placed it on the ice, over which the wind, which was in our favor, and a sail, made it go as on water’—the first example of ‘ice-boating’ that, as far as we know, appears in American history. On the eighteenth of March, the eve of St. Joseph’s day, he found himself on the shores of Lake Michigan, and, of course, he gave it the name of the saint. He notes that it was a bitter cold day, the wind was high, the ice formed on the paddles, and the canoe was nearly crushed between the shore ice and the cakes that were driven in by the gale.

On the next day he found the famous ‘pitch rock’ which he said gave them material for caulking the canoe and sealing his letters. The exact locality of this rock has been identified by Dr. Hobbs of the University of Wisconsin, as being in Whitefish Bay, a few miles north of Milwaukee. It rises slightly above the water, and in it there are many cavities filled with a semi-fluid, tar-like bitumen.

He journeyed seventy-six leagues over the lake before he reached the Illinois country, where he was received most hospitably. Eighty Indians came out to meet him. At their head was the chief, holding a firebrand in one hand, and in the other a calumet, tricked out with feathers. Advancing about thirty steps in front of his braves, he made one of the characteristic Indian speeches and conducted the missionary to the wigwam that had been made ready for him.

He arrived at Kaskaskia on the twenty-seventh, where he had been the year before. It was the largest of the Illinois villages, and consisted of three hundred and fifty-one cabins, all ranged along the river bank. It was an unhealthy spot, but was well adapted to give the people a chance to see an approaching enemy. He did not stop with

them long, however, for this expedition was only to prospect in order to determine the most advantageous place for the central mission. He returned again in 1678, and during his absence the Iroquois had made their appearance, but had been put to flight by the watchful Illinois. There Allouez passed the remaining years of his life. He wrote much about his mission; always graphically and interestingly, and one reads with the greatest delight the account of the events that occurred there, his description of the country, the habits of the people. He remained eleven years in this apostolic field, and on the night of August 27-28, 1689, near what is now Niles, Michigan, on St. Joseph's River, among the Miamies, he died. He was sixty-seven years old, and he is credited with having instructed during his apostolic career 100,000 natives, 10,000 of whom he baptized. He had earned his name as the second Xavier.³

Dr. Alvord pays a fine tribute to Father Allouez. He says:

“Marquette's successor in the Illinois mission, Father Claude Jean Allouez, S. J., played an important role in the establishment of the white man in the west. For twenty-four years his figure was a familiar one wherever new missions were to be established or maintained. His first duties called him to Lake Superior, almost unknown at the time; and his correspondence proves him to have been a keen and sympathetic observer of his environment. He soon came in contact with the Illinois, who visited his mission, and his pen wrote the earliest account of the Indians who have given their name to the state. In 1669 Father Allouez was transferred to the mission at Sault Ste. Marie and shortly afterwards visited the Indians at Green Bay and along the upper Fox. He may have been the first Frenchman to stand on the banks of a river discharging its water into the Gulf of Mexico. ‘Heedless of fatigue or hunger, cold or heat, he traveled over snow and ice, swollen streams or dangerous rapids, seeking distant Indian villages, counting it all joy if by any means he could win a few savages for a heavenly future.’ So a modern writer describes the life of this man.

After Marquette's death Allouez visited the Illinois mission once or twice and was there when he learned of the approach of La Salle, whose well-known suspicious and masterful character caused the missionary to retire. In 1684 it is recorded that he delivered to Tonti the governor's summons to Quebec, and in 1686, he was once more attending to his duties on the Illinois river without molestation from Tonti. In 1689 this devoted servant of the cross died at the Miami village on St. Joseph river.⁴

The first experience of Father Allouez in Illinois is most interesting, and may appropriately be related here, even if it did not occur on the main channel of the Illinois. The reception of the Indians above spoken of is here alluded to, and is best described in Father Allouez's own words:

³ *Ib.*, p. 162, *et. seq.*

⁴ Alvord, *The Illinois Country*, pp. 102-103.

“The captain came about 30 steps to meet me, carrying in one hand a firebrand and in the other a Calumet adorned with feathers. Approaching me, he placed it in my mouth and himself lighted the tobacco, which obliged me to make a pretense of smoking it. Then he made me come into his Cabin, and having given me the place of honor, he spoke to me as follows:

‘My Father, have pity on me; suffer me to return with thee, to bear thee company and take thee into my village. The meeting I have had today with thee will prove fatal to me if I do not use it to my advantage. Thou bearest to us the gospel and the prayer. If I lose the opportunity of listening to thee, I shall be punished by the loss of my nephews, whom thou seest in so great number; without doubt they will be defeated by our enemies. Let us embark, then, in company, that I may profit by thy coming into our land.’⁵

Father Allouez was no stranger to the Illinois Indians. He had in his extremely wide range of travel met them and learned much of their characteristics and conduct as early as 1666, when he wrote of them in his journal of his voyage to the Outaouac (Ottawa) country. What he says of the Illinois family of the Algonquins is very interesting. It is also interesting that he gives us two variations of the spelling of the Indian designation of these savages, viz., *Ilimouec* and *Alimouek*.

His description follows:

The Ilimouec speak Algonquin, but a very different dialect from those of all the other tribes. I understand them only slightly, because I have talked with them only a very little. They do not live in these regions, their country being more than sixty leagues hence toward the south, beyond a great river—which, as well as I can conjecture, empties into the sea somewhere near Virginia. These people are hunters and warriors, using bows and arrows, rarely muskets, and never canoes. They used to be a populous nation, divided into ten large villages; but now they are reduced to two, continual wars with the Nadouessi on one side and the Iroquois on the other having well-nigh exterminated them.

They acknowledge many spirits to whom they offer sacrifice. They practise a kind of dance, quite peculiar to themselves, which they call ‘the dance of the tobacco-pipe.’ It is executed thus: they prepare a great pipe, which they deck with plumes, and put in the middle of the room, with a sort of veneration. One of the company rises, begins to dance, and then yields his place to another, and this one to a third; and thus they dance in succession, one after another, and not together. One would take this dance for a pantomime ballet; and it is executed to the beating of a drum. The performer makes war in rhythmic time, preparing his arms, attiring himself, running, discovering the

⁵ Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, Vol. 60, quoted in Quaife, *Chicago and the Old Northwest*, p. 29, *et. seq.*

foe, raising the cry, slaying the enemy, removing his scalp, and returning home with a song of victory, and all with an astonishing exactness, promptitude and agility. After they have all danced, one after another, around the pipe, it is taken and offered to the chief man in the whole assembly, for him to smoke; then to another, and so in succession to all. This ceremony resembles in its significance the French custom of drinking, several out of the same glass; but, in addition, the pipe is left in the keeping of the most honored man, as a sacred trust, and a sure pledge of the peace and union that will ever subsist among them as long as it shall remain in that person's hands.

Of all the spirits to whom they offer sacrifice, they honor with a very special worship one who is pre-eminent above the others, as they maintain, because he is the maker of all things. Such a passionate desire have they to see him that they keep long fasts to that end, hoping that by this means God will be induced to appear to them in their sleep; and if they chance to see Him, they deem themselves happy, and assured of a long life.

All the nations of the south have this same wish to see God, which, without doubt, greatly facilitates their conversion; for it only remains to teach them how they must serve Him in order to see Him and be blessed.

I have proclaimed the name of Jesus Christ here to eighty people of this nation, and they have carried it and published it with approbation to the whole country of the south; consequently I can say that this mission is the one where I have labored the least and accomplished the most. They honor our Lord among themselves in their own way, putting His image, which I have given them, in the most honored place on the occasion of any important feast, while the master of the banquet addresses it as follows: 'In Thy honor, O Man-God, do we hold this feast; to Thee do we offer these viands.'

I confess that the fairest field for the Gospel appears to me to be yonder. Had I had leisure and opportunity, I would have pushed on to their country, to see with my own eyes all the good things there of which they tell me.

I find all those with whom I have mingled affable and humane; and it is said that whenever they meet a stranger they give a cry of joy, caress him, and show him every possible evidence of affection. I have baptized but one child of this nation. The seeds of the Faith which I have sown in their souls will bear fruit when it pleases the Master of the vine to gather it. Their country is warm, and they raise two crops of Indian corn a year. There are rattlesnakes there, which cause many deaths among them, as they do not know the antidote. They hold medicines in high esteem, offering sacrifice to them as to great spirits. They have no forests in their country, but vast prairies instead, where oxen, cows, deer, bears, and other animals feed in great numbers."⁶

⁶ Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, Vols. 50 and 51, quoted in Kellogg, *Early Narratives of the Northwest*, p. 130, *et. seq.*

These statements made by Father Allouez make it easy to understand why he met with such enthusiasm on the part of the savages. We can appreciate how the "eighty people" to whom Allouez had "proclaimed the name of Jesus Christ" at the Mission of La Pointe, and who had "carried it and published it with approbation to the whole country of the south" would rejoice at again seeing their black robed friend. In like manner we can understand the satisfaction which Father Allouez felt in coming to the Illinois mission, in view of his declaration, "I confess that the fairest field for the Gospel appears to me to be yonder (that is, in Illinois). Had I leisure and opportunity I would have pushed on to their country to see with my own eyes all the good things there of which they tell me."

We have noted the reception of the new missionary on the Lake Front, at what is now the foot of Madison Street, then the mouth of the Chicago river (additional reason, besides the landing at the same place of Marquette, for counting this a hallowed spot), and are able to follow him to the site of the mission of the Immaculate Conception, of which he is now the head.

Arriving on the grounds, April 27, 1677, he enters into possession of the identical cabin occupied by Father Marquette, his saintly predecessor. After a few days' preparations he signalizes his coming by the great missionary ceremonial described in his own language, "to take possession of these tribes in the name of Jesus Christ on the 3rd day of May (1677), the feast of the Holy Cross, I erected in the midst of the town a cross 35 feet high, chanting the *Vexila Regis* in the presence of a great number of Illinois of all tribes, of whom I can say in truth that they did not take Jesus crucified for a folly nor for a scandal. On the contrary, they witnessed the ceremony with great respect and heard all on the mystery with admiration. The children even wanted to kiss the Cross through devotion, and the old earnestly commended me to place it well so that it could not fall."

Thus Father Allouez begun his missionary work amongst the Illinois, which he continued as resident and visiting missionary and vicar-general of the Bishop of Quebec for eleven years. He was not a man to neglect any portion of his jurisdiction, and in the performance of his duties as Vicar-General he traveled about extensively, giving his special attention to the Miami tribes, who, in his day, centered around the St. Joseph River, and visiting and caring also for the Pottawatomi, who began to gather in the region, near the southern end of Lake Michigan.

⁷ Shea, *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi*, p. 77.

Three years after the coming of Father Allouez Robert Cavalier Sieur de La Salle and his party passed down the Illinois River, touching at the Kaskaskia village, the site of the mission of the Immaculate Conception, on the first day of January, 1680. During the next ten years the intrepid explorer passed that way several times, and in the romantic recitals of these journeys reference will be found to the sturdy missionary who, whether through choice or fear, as intimated by some (a quite unlikely supposition), did not meet La Salle, but continued to exercise his missionary faculties and functions until the time of his death.

The story of La Salle and his relation to the Illinois River is a very interesting one, which will be duly related, but, due to the fact that the civil regime of La Salle extended beyond the period of both Allouez and his successor, Rev. Sebastien Rale, S. J., the La Salle story will be postponed until after we have told that of Father Rale.

Like all the other missionaries Allouez wore out his life in the mission field, and came to his death on August 27, 1689, in the midst of the Miami Indians, at their village near what is now South Bend, Indiana.⁸

We are fortunate in having preserved to the present day some relics of the first two great missionaries, Marquette and Allouez. Of the saintly Marquette some of his sacred bones repose in a suitable reliquary in Marquette College, Milwaukee, and some of them still lie buried in the tomb under the monument at St. Ignace. Of Father Allouez there is still preserved an ostensorium, presented by Nicholas Perrot in 1686, and frequently used by the great missionary.

REV. SEBASTIEN RALE, S. J.

We next learn of the activities along the Illinois from the letter of Father Sebastien Rale, S. J., who succeeded Father Allouez.

Father Rale was the missionary of the Abnakis, located in what became Maine. He arrived in Quebec from Rochelle, France, on October 13, 1689, and in a short time was assigned to the Abnakis, who then had a village within three miles of Quebec. "When I had remained nearly two years with the Abnakis," says Father Rale, "I was recalled by my superiors. They had assigned me to the mission of the Illinois, who had just lost their missionary. I then went to Quebec, whence, after I had devoted three months to studying

⁸ Readers will be interested in the paper of William Stetson Merrill on Allouez, published in the July, 1922, number of the ILLINOIS CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, p. 59, *et. seq.*

the Algonkin language, I set out on the 13th of August in a canoe for the land of the Illinois." Father Rale describes his journey at considerable length, and tells in detail of the different tribes of Indians he met on his way. He especially dwells upon the Michabou tribe, or the tribe of the "Great Hare," a tribe holding one of the most ludicrous religious delusions known amongst savages. Finally the writer describes his entry into Illinois, and his work in the Illinois missions:

"After forty days of travel I entered the river of the Illinois [in the spring of 1692], and, after voyaging fifty leagues, I came to their first Village, which had three hundred cabins, all of them with four or five fires. One fire is always for two families. They have eleven Villages belonging to their tribe. On the day after my arrival, I was invited by the principal chief to a grand repast, which he was giving to the most important men of the Tribe. He had ordered several dogs to be killed; such a feast is considered among the Savages a magnificent feast; therefore it is called 'the feast of the Captains.' The ceremonies that are observed are the same among all these Tribes. It is usual at this sort of feast for the Savages to deliberate upon their most important affairs,—as, for instance, when there is question either of undertaking war against their neighbors, or of terminating it by propositions of peace.

When all the guests had arrived they took their places all about the cabin, seating themselves either on the bare ground or on the mats. Then the Chief arose and began his address. I confess to you that I admired his flow of language, the justness and force of the arguments that he presented, the eloquent turn he gave to them, and the choice and nicety of the expressions with which he adorned his speech. I fully believe that, if I had written down what this Savage said to us, offhand and without preparation, you would readily acknowledge that the most able Europeans could scarcely, after much thought and study, compose an address that would be more forceful and better arranged.

When the speech was finished, two Savages, who performed the duty of stewards, distributed dishes to the whole company, and each dish served for two guests; while eating, they conversed together on indifferent matters; and when they had finished their repast they withdrew,—carrying away, according to their custom, what remained on their dishes.

The Illinois do not give those feasts that are customary among other Savage Tribes, at which a person is obliged to eat all that has been given him, even should he burst. When any one is present at such a feast and is unable to observe this ridiculous rule, he applies to one of the guests whom he knows to have a better appetite, and says to him: 'My brother, take pity on me; I am a dead man if thou

^o Father Rale's name has been spelled variously as Râle, Rale, Ralles, Rasle and Rasles. In his *Pioneer Priests* Father Campbell uses Rale, but in his latest work *The Jesuits* he uses Rasles.

do not give me life. Eat what I have left, and I will make thee a present of something.' This is their only way out of their perplexity.

The Illinois are covered only around the waist, otherwise they go entirely nude; many panels with all sorts of figures, which they mark upon the body in an ineffaceable manner, take with them the place of garments. It is only when they make visits, or when they are present at Church, that they wrap themselves in a cloak of dressed skin in the summer-time, and in the winter season in a dressed skin with the hair left on, that they may keep warm. They adorn the head with feathers of many colors, of which they make garlands and crowns, which they arrange very becomingly; above all things, they are careful to paint the face with different colors, but especially with vermillion. They wear collars and earrings made of little stones, which they cut like precious stones; some are blue, some red, and some white as alabaster; to these must be added a flat piece of porcelain which finishes the collar. The Illinois are persuaded that these grotesque ornaments add grace to their appearance, and win for them respect.

When the Illinois are not engaged in war or in hunting, their time is spent either in games, or at feasts, or in dancing. They have two kinds of dances; some are a sign of rejoicing, and to these they invite the most distinguished women and young girls; others are a token of their sadness at the death of the most important men of their Tribe. It is by these dances that they profess to honor the deceased, and to wipe away the tears of his relatives. All of them are entitled to have the death of their near relatives bewailed in this manner, provided that they make presents for this purpose. The dances last a longer or shorter time according to the price and value of the presents,—which, at the end of the dance, are distributed to the dancers. It is not their custom to bury their dead; they wrap them in skins, and hang them by the feet and head to the tops of trees.

When the men are not at games, feasts or dances, they remain quiet on their mats, and spend their times either in sleeping or in making bows, arrows, calumets, and other articles of that sort. As for the women, they work from morning until evening like slaves. It is they who cultivate the land and plant the Indian corn, in summer; and, as soon as winter begins, they are employed in making mats, dressing skins, and in many other kinds of work,—for their first care is to supply the cabin with everything that is necessary.

Among all the Tribes of Canada, there is not one that lives in so great abundance of everything as do the Illinois. Their rivers are covered with swans, bustards, ducks and teal. We can hardly travel a league without meeting a prodigious multitude of Turkeys, which go in troops, sometimes to the number of 200. They are larger than those that are seen in France. I had the curiosity to weigh one of them, and it weighed thirty-six livres. They have a sort of hairy beard at the neck, which is half a foot long.

Bears and deer are found there in great numbers; there are also found countless numbers of oxen, and of roebucks; there is no year when they do not kill more than a thousand roebucks, and more than two thousand oxen; as far as the eye can reach, are seen from four

to five thousand oxen grazing on the prairies. They have a hump on the back, and the head is extremely large. Their hair, except that on the head, is curly and soft, like wool; their flesh is strong in its natural state, and is so light that, even if it be eaten wholly raw, it causes no indigestion. When they have killed an ox that seems to them too lean, they are satisfied to take its tongue and go in search of one that is more fat.

Arrows are the principal weapons that they use in war and in hunting. These arrows are barbed at the tip with a stone, sharpened and cut in the shape of a serpent's tongue; if knives are lacking, they use arrows also for flaying the animals which they kill. They are so adroit in bending the bow that they scarcely ever miss their aim; and they do this with such quickness that they will have discharged a hundred arrows sooner than another person can reload his gun.

They take little trouble to make nets suitable for catching fish in the rivers, because the abundance of all kinds of animals, which they find for their subsistence renders them somewhat indifferent to fish. However, when they take a fancy to have some, they enter a canoe with their bows and arrows; they stand up that they may better discover the fish, and as soon as they see one they pierce it with an arrow.

Among the Illinois the only way of acquiring public esteem and regard is, as among other Savages, to gain the reputation of a skillful hunter, and, still further, of a good warrior; it is chiefly in this latter that they make their merit consist, and it is this which they call being truly a man. They are so eager for this glory that we see them undertake journeys of four hundred leagues through the midst of forests in order to capture a slave, or to take off the scalp of a man whom they have killed. They count as nothing the hardships and the long fasting that they must undergo, especially when they are drawing near the country of the enemy; for then they no longer dare to hunt, for fear that the animals, being only wounded, may escape with the arrow in the body, and warn their enemy to put himself in a posture of defense. For their manner of making war, as among all the Savages, is to surprise their enemies; therefore they send out scouts to observe the number and movements of the enemy, and to see if they are on their guard. According to the report that is brought to them, they either lie in ambush, or make a foray on the cabins, war-club in hand; and they are sure to kill some of their foes before the latter can even think of defending themselves.

The war-club is made of a deer's horn or of wood, shaped like a cutlass, with a large ball at the end. They hold the war-club in one hand, and a knife in the other. As soon as they have dealt a blow at the head of their enemy, they make on it a circular cut with a knife, and take off the scalp with surprising quickness.

When a savage returns to his own country laden with many scalps, he is received with great honor; but he is at the height of his glory when he takes prisoners and brings them home alive. As soon as he arrives, all the people of the village meet together, and range themselves on both sides of the way where the prisoners must pass. This

reception is very cruel; some tear out the prisoners' nails, others cut off their fingers or ears; still others load them with blows from clubs.

After this first welcome, the old men assemble in order to consider whether they shall grant life to their prisoners, or give orders for their death. When there is any dead man to be resuscitated, that is to say, if any one of their warriors has been killed, and they think it a duty to replace him in his cabin,—they give to this cabin one of their prisoners, who takes the place of the deceased; and this is what they call 'resuscitating the dead.'

When the prisoner has been condemned to death, they immediately set up in the ground a large stake, to which they fasten him by both hands; they cause the death song to be chanted, and—all the Savages being seated around the stake, at the distance of a few steps—there is kindled a large fire, in which they make their hatchets, gun-barrels, and other iron tools red-hot. Then they come, one after another, and apply these red-hot irons to the different parts of his body; some of them burn him with live brands; some mangle the body with their knives; others cut off a piece of the flesh already roasted, and eat it in his presence; some are seen filling his wounds with powder and rubbing it over his whole body, after which they set it on fire. In fine, each one torments him according to his own caprice; and this continues for four or five hours, and sometimes even during two or three days. The more sharp and piercing are the cries which the violence of these torments make him utter, so much the more is the spectacle pleasing and diverting to these barbarians. It was the Iroquois who invented this frightful manner of death, and it is only by the law of retaliation that the Illinois, in their turn, treat these Iroquois prisoners with an equal cruelty.

What we understand by the word *Christianity* is known among the Savages only by the name of *Prayer*. Thus, when I tell you in the continuation of this letter that such a savage Tribe has embraced Prayer, you must understand that it has become Christian, or that it is about to become so. There would be much less difficulty in converting the Illinois, if Prayer permitted them to practice Polygamy; they acknowledge that prayer is good, and they are delighted to have it taught to their wives and children; but, when we speak of it to them for themselves, we realize how difficult it is to fix their natural inconstancy, and to persuade them to have only one wife and to have her always.

At the hour when we assemble, morning and evening, to pray, all persons repair to the Chapel. Even the greatest Jugglers—that is to say, the greatest enemies to Religion—send their children to be instructed and baptized. This is the greatest advantage that we have at first among the Savages, and of which we are most certain,—for, of the great number of children whom we baptize, no year passes that many do not die before they have attained the use of reason; and, as for the adults, the greater part are so devoted and attached to Prayer that they would suffer the most cruel death rather than abandon it.

It is fortunate for the Illinois that they are very far distant from Quebec; for brandy cannot be taken to them, as is done elsewhere.

Among the Savages this liquor is the greatest obstacle to Christianity, and is the source of countless crimes. It is known that they buy it in order to plunge themselves into the most furious intoxication; the disturbances and the melancholy deaths which are witnessed every day ought indeed to outweigh the profit that is made in the trade of so fatal a liquor.

I had remained two years with the Illinois, when I was recalled, that I might devote the remainder of my days to the Abnakis Tribe.''¹⁰

The foregoing very remarkable document has been very little noticed, due to the fact that Father Rale spent but a short time in the Illinois missions, and was for thirty years in the Abnakis missions in Maine, where he was brutally massacred by the English soldiers, sent out from Boston. Most of what has been said about Father Rale therefore has had to do with his labors in Maine and his tragic death. All this has been set out interestingly in Father Campbell's *Pioneer Priests of North America*.¹¹ Another reason that this letter of Father Rale's has not been given much attention arises from the fact that it appears in the midst of a long letter written by Father Rale to his brother describing his missionary career, nearly all of which was spent in Maine, and the searcher could easily overlook the few pages in the body of the letter that dealt with Illinois. This letter, it is to be noticed, was written in 1723, under the date of October 12, thirty years after Father Rale's labors in Illinois had closed, and only one year before his untimely death. There can be no possible doubt, however, but that he was in possession of his full mental faculties and had an excellent recollection at the time the letter was written. This is evidenced, if evidence were needed, by his presentation in the same letter of a translation of the hymn "*O Salutaris Hostia*" in four different Indian languages. In view of the fact that so few have access to publications containing these letters, these verses are here reproduced:

IN THE ABNAKIS TONGUE

Kighist wi-nuanurwinns
 Spem kik papili go ii damek
 Nemiani wi kwidan ghabenk
 Taha saii grihine.

¹⁰ Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, Vol. 67, p. 163, *et. seq.*

¹¹ Father Campbell's sketch of Father Rale will be found in Vol. 3 of *Pioneer Priests of North America*, beginning at page 265.

IN THE ALGONKIN TONGUE

Kwerais Jesus tegousenam
 Nera weul ka stisian
 Ka rio vilighe miang
 Vas mama vik umong.

IN THE HURON TONGUE

Jesous outeo etti x'ichie
 Outo etti skiaalichi-axe
 J chierche axerawensta
 D'aotierti xeata-wein.

IN THE ILLINOIS TONGUE

Pekiziane manet we
 Piaro nile hi Nanghi
 Keninama wi o uKangha
 Mero winang ousiang hi.¹²

No other writer, unless it be Charlevoix, has given nearly as good an account of the Indians in the Illinois country as is contained in this letter of Father Rale's. It possesses an advantage over Charlevoix's account, due to the fact that Father Rale was amongst these Indians for a much longer period than was Charlevoix.

The temptation to follow Father Rale to his permanent destination in Maine, and recount some of the stirring incidents of his really notable life, is strong, but as this has been so well done by Father Campbell we here refrain.

Sebastien Rale was born January 4, 1657, in the little town of Portalier, which is situated on the Doubs, a tributary of the Saone. He arrived at Quebec in October, 1689, and, as has been seen, came into the Illinois missions in 1692. He was, therefore, but thirty-five years old when he came to the Illinois missions. He came to his death at the age of fifty-two, and the reader will be interested in the account of this remarkable martyrdom as given by Father Campbell:

"In the beginning of August, 1724, one thousand one hundred men, partly English, partly Indian, started out to perform the final act of the tragedy. Counting the expedition of nineteen years before, this was the fifth attempt to capture him. The English historians cut the number of men in this raid down to two hundred and eight, but Charlevoix and de la Chasse vouch for the first figures. There were two commanders this time: Harmon and Moulton.

¹² Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, Vol. 67.

On the nineteenth of August they left Fort Richmond on the Kennebec; and in the following day they arrived at Teeconnet. Leaving there forty men to guard the nineteen whale boats, which had transported the party thus far, they began their march to the village on the twenty-first, diverting themselves on the way by shooting at two Indian women, killing one and taking the other prisoner. The murdered squaw was the wife of Bomaseen, the chief who had been assiduous in his efforts to conciliate the English and who was supposed to have been converted at Boston when his religious difficulties were discussed over a tankard. The murder would soon matter little for Bomaseen, for he himself and his son-in-law were killed two days afterwards at Narantsouac.

About midday the invaders were near the village. Like Indians they crept cautiously through the woods, and at three o'clock stood before the silent wigwams. Not a soul was seen. Then at a given signal every musket blazed and a shower of bullets pierced the thin walls of the houses. Hutchison denies this, and says the Indians fired first, though he admits that the settlement was surrounded before any one was aware of what was happening. There were only fifty warriors in the place, and they seized their weapons and rushed out to cover the flight of their women and children, who were already making a mad rush for the river. Where was Rale? He was already facing the foe. He was the only one whom the English wanted, and he knew that if he presented himself it would divert their attention from the fugitives. He was not mistaken. A loud shout greeted his appearance. The man they had so often failed to find was before them. Every musket covered him, and he fell riddled with bullets at the foot of the cross which he had planted in the centre of the village. They crushed in his skull with hatchets again and again, filled his mouth and eyes with filth, tore off his scalp, which they sold afterwards at Boston, and stripped his body of his soutane, which they wanted as a trophy, but as it was too ragged to keep they flung it back on the corpse. Meantime the fire was kept up on the fleeing Indians, who were endeavoring to reach the shelter of the woods on the other shore. Some were slain before they reached the river, others were killed in midstream, and others before they reached the protecting forest.

When the slaughter was over, the soldiers retraced their steps to the village and began the work of plunder. They desecrated the Blessed Sacrament, and defiled the vessels of the altar. Then putting the torch to the buildings, they withdrew in the glare of the conflagration. They were laden with booty, and Hutchison tells us that the New England Puritan thought it no sacrilege to take the plate from an idolatrous Roman Catholic Church; which he supposes 'was all the profaneness offered to the sacred vessels.' There were also some expressions of zeal against idolatry in breaking the crucifixes and other imagery which were found there. So died Sebastian Rale. The 'Inflammatory friar' would flare up no more.

The raiders were received with enthusiasm at Boston. There is little doubt that the missionary's white scalp was put up at auction and duly knocked down to the highest bidder. Harmon received a

promotion, and Moulton was awarded the thanks of a grateful country. The Rev. Dr. Colman, of Boston, declared that Rale's death was 'the singular work of God. The officers and soldiers piously put far from themselves the honor of it; and he who was the father of the war, the ghostly father of those perfidious savages like Balaam, the son of Beos, was slain among the enemy after vain attempts to curse us.' The Reverend Doctor would have been a good warchief.¹³

It is regrettable that we have very little information regarding what actually occurred along the Illinois while Father Rale was in charge of the mission. He was recognized as the missionary of the Abnakis, and was consequently held in Illinois but a short time, when he was returned to the former. He himself has told us that the Illinois Indians responded gratifyingly to the efforts of Father Marquette and Father Allouez, and that they were singularly devout, remarking that, in the absence of the missionary, the tribes, under the leadership of a patriarch, selected for the purpose, held prayer meetings regularly and recited in common the prayers prescribed by the missionary.

Father Rale was a historic figure. He became the pawn of war, being a Frenchman and associated with the French, he was considered an enemy of the English, and in the conflict between the two races Father Rale paid the penalty of his citizenry with his life. He is entitled to rank not only with the martyrs and most exalted of the missionaries, but on account of his persecution and martyrdom, with the fathers of the country.

The successor of Father Rale was Rev. James Gravier, S. J., whose story is almost as interesting as that of his illustrious predecessors, and will be narrated in due season in these studies.

JOSEPH J. THOMPSON.

Chicago.

¹³ Campbell, *Pioneer Priests of North America*, Vol. 3, p. 301, *et. seq.*

DISTORTING AMERICAN HISTORY

On the Fourth of July a quiet, orderly, well attended celebration of the day was held in Lincoln Park, Springfield, Illinois, within a short distance of the Lincoln Monument. The Declaration of Independence was read in full with fine effect by Mrs. Eva Batterton. A fine address on the Revolutionary fathers was delivered by Hon. A. H. Bell of Carlinville, Illinois, followed by an address by former Congressman James M. Graham of Springfield.

The *Illinois State Register* deemed Mr. Graham's address of sufficient importance to publish it in full, calling attention to it in the following editorial:

"If as the Hon. James M. Graham sets forth in an interesting and instructive address printed in detail in today's issues of the *State Register*, British propaganda is creeping insidiously into histories used as textbooks in our public schools, the wrong should be righted and repetition of it prevented.

"When a man of Mr. Graham's standing, character and ability, charges 'falsification of American history' and backs his charges with a very startling array of comprehensive data, his utterances demand more than passing attention.

"Any tampering with facts for any purpose by any group or groups can only be accepted as a direct insult to American intelligence and American ideals of right and justice.

"The *State Register* calls special attention today to Mr. Graham's address because its importance justifies it.

"Such utterances justify more than public study and interest. They justify official study and action.

"If the charges are true, failure to correct the wrong either by revision of the vitiated histories or barring them from the schools, cannot but become a menace to that peace which all sincere friends of America and Great Britain believe should be maintained between these two great nations."

Today is a good time to take an inventory of our national affairs. I think you'll admit that one of our most valuable assets is our children and that another one is the high ideals established by the brave, wise and farseeing men of the Revolutionary period.

The adoption of the Declaration of Independence marked the beginning of a new era in history. That great document announced principles which must have been astounding to a world governed by monarchs and aristocrats through standing armies. How they must have been shocked when they learned that a new government was founded in the New World on the principle that all men are created equal, and that governments should rest—not on military power or the divine right of Kings, but on the consent of the people.

The Declaration of Independence is indeed a marvelous production from whatever angle we view it. Whether we consider its rhetoric, its morals, its philosophy, or its politics, it is alike admirable.

But its adoption was a direct challenge to the greatest military power then in the world—not to a mere holiday tilt, but to mortal combat.

The signers of the Declaration knew this, they knew the risk they ran, but they solemnly pledged themselves to support it with their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

They were well aware of what failure meant. At the time of the signing, one of them, thinking of colonial discord, remarked: "Now we are bound to hang together," and Franklin wittily and truthfully responded: "Yes, if we don't hang together, we will be sure to hang separately."

They knew they were guilty of treason under English law, and they knew equally well that the penalty for that offense was the cruelest and most brutal form of death, but this knowledge did not deter them.

We know how bravely, how successfully they kept their pledge, how, after years of endurance and travail, they won their fight, and gave to their descendants, and to the world, an inheritance valuable beyond description, a free government resting on a Constitution which secures the blessing of orderly liberty.

This inheritance is not a gift to be wasted or squandered. It is a Trust to be enjoyed, to be carefully conserved, and handed down from generation to generation in perpetuity.

I sometimes think we are not as careful of that great Trust as we should be. We ought to be constantly mindful of our duty and our responsibility in regard to it, but I doubt if we are. It is not enough to just talk about Liberty and admire it and congratulate ourselves over it on the 4th of July. We should guard it jealously all the time. No one has spoken more wisely than he who told us that eternal vigilance is the price we must pay for liberty.

A good way—perhaps the best way—to do this is to keep before our minds, and more particularly before the minds of our children the splendid example of the men who adopted and fought to maintain the great Declaration and of those who framed our great charter of liberty, the Constitution. They were men of great ability, of high character, of sublime courage and of intense patriotism. What better way to train our youth in good citizenship than to keep constantly before them such high ideals? "As a man thinketh, so is he." The name of Washington appeals to all that is best in us, the memory of Nathan Hale is still an inspiration to every American boy.

It would be difficult to praise beyond their deserts the men who achieved our independence and founded the Republic, or to give our

children a too exalted notion of their character and their achievement. It is our constant duty to teach them to respect and admire these men who risked all for Independence, and placed government of the people by the people on an enduring basis.

But while we have been drifting along in supposed security, the wells of history from which our children draw their information were being poisoned, and we hardly gave the matter a thought.

We feel so strong as a nation that we are careless, even contemptuous, of danger. But the very strength of the strong man may prove to be a real weakness, because in the pride of his great strength he thinks caution unnecessary. By such a course he invites disaster.

And that is the course we have been pursuing. Instead of furnishing school histories which would teach our children respect and admiration for the Revolutionary heroes, we have in common use a dozen different text books used in tens of thousands of the public and private schools of America which both directly and indirectly attack the patriotism and undermine the character of the great men whose deeds we came to praise, whose memories we are here to honor.

This must seem so incredible to those who have not noticed its progress that I ask you to be patient while I state the case, and however ridiculous or incredible it may seem to you now, I ask you to please withhold judgment till I have presented a few, and only a few, of the facts.

To make the situation clearer, let me give a brief resume by way of background.

In the stirring times which preceded Lexington and Concord, there were but few men who, like Samuel Adams, James Otis and Patrick Henry, declared themselves in favor of complete independence. Even after Lexington and Concord, probably not much over half the population favored a war for independence. The timid and the cautious ones feared to enter such a struggle, while the Loyalists or Tories were bitterly opposed to it under any circumstances.

After the victory at Saratoga, and the surrender of Burgoyne, Washington could have secured any terms of peace he desired if only he would recognize the sovereignty of the British crown, but he refused to consider anything short of absolute independence.

The assistance of France undoubtedly turned the scale in our favor, resulted in ultimate success and absolute independence.

But after the victory was won, troubles began to multiply. It was easy to hang together while there was danger of hanging separately, but after the victory it was not so easy. Local jealousies and

bickerings appeared. There was little real union, and no real government, for there was no central authority. "A rope of sand" they called the Confederation. It lacked coherence. Few thought it could hold together long.

For over seven years—from the close of the war to the adoption of the Constitution—the case seemed desperate. It appeared inevitable that the colonies would soon be back under English domination. English statesmen were of that opinion. They held that the victory of the colonies was due to British international difficulties, and that the separation was only temporary. And there was, apparently, grounds for this belief.

But events favored the young Republic and baffled Britain. After five years of practical chaos, a convention was called, with Washington as chairman, to consider the situation. By September, 1787, this convention agreed on a proposed Constitution. That Constitution was submitted to the legislatures of the various states, and in March, 1789, after a delay of a year and a half, a sufficient number of states had ratified it to secure its adoption.

It was fortunate for America that during this time Great Britain was too much occupied with European affairs to attempt the re-conquest of her former colonies. In 1789 came the French Revolution. Out of it came Napoleon and the Napoleonic wars, so that England was constantly engaged in European warfare till the new government had time to find itself. But Britain had not given up hope.

Of course she has now no hope of absorbing the United States through conquest, but that she still has hope of absorbing it by other methods, seems too plain to be doubted.

Who among you will say that Cecil Rhodes, the South African diamond king, was a mere dreamer of dreams? Through superior ability, he became one of the richest men in the world, and by his unscrupulous genius he added an empire to the British domain. Few of his plans failed. When such a man deliberately regards a project as feasible, when he plans for its accomplishment, and invests his money in it, is not his scheme at least worthy of some attention?

In Basil Williams' life of Rhodes you will find a sketch of his proposed will from which I quote as follows:

"Directed: That a secret society should be endowed with the following objects: The extension of British rule throughout the world * * * The colonization by British subjects in all lands where means of livelihood are attainable by labor, energy and enterprise, and especially the occupation, by British settlers, of the entire continent of

Africa; the Holy Land; the Valley of the Euphrates; the Islands of Cyprus and Candia; the whole of South America; the islands of the Pacific not heretofore possessed by Great Britain: the whole of the Malay Archipelago; the seaboard of China and Japan; the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire.”¹

A rather ambitious scheme, isn't it? And please notice that much of it has been realized already. The Holy Land, the Valley of the Euphrates, all of the islands of the Pacific south of the Equator, Candia and Cyprus and most of the Continent of Africa are now under British control.

TREASON TO AMERICAN TRADITION

I hold in my hand a pamphlet written by Mr. Charles Grant Miller of New York City, entitled “Treason to American Tradition,” in which, with great ability, he exposes the insidious attempt now being made to de-Americanize our children. I shall have more to say of Mr. Miller later on. Just now I quote him on this Rhodes propaganda. He says:

“It has been publicly stated that among the twenty-three rules of guidance of the Cecil Rhodes secret society, one provides for the re-writing of American school histories, and another provides for the gradual restriction of our public school education,” and he adds that two known members of this Rhodes secret society are high in the councils of our two most heavily financed American educational foundations.²

He created a large “Foundation” by which he provided for two free perpetual scholarships from each state of the Union—or 96 at a time from all the states—at Oxford university. He assigns to each student the sum of three hundred pounds, or about \$1,500.00 per year, for three years. Applicants for these scholarships must have done at least two years' successful work in some college of high standing, and must show marked ability, but they are to be chosen mainly on account of their force of character, and their capacity for leadership. Clearly they are intended to be leaven which, he hoped, would, in time, leaven the whole lump.

There are now about four hundred of these Rhodes graduates in the United States. They have organized an Alumni association, and Mr. Miller says this association recently adopted a resolution endors-

¹ Basil Williams' *Life of Cecil Rhodes*, page 50.

² Charles Grant Miller in the *New York American*, May 21, 1922.

ing and approving the propaganda plan for anglicizing histories in American schools.

Mr. Rhodes wisely concluded that in the future hundreds, and even thousands of the ablest and most aggressive young Americans, educated at Oxford, thoroughly imbued with British ideas and British sympathies, having a natural sense of gratitude for favors received, would in due time exert great influence in favor of their benefactor's ambition. It already seems that he was not mistaken.

Now take another instance. Who is bold enough to assert that Andrew Carnegie was a mere dreamer of dreams? Mr. Carnegie was a very successful, far-seeing man. He was a Briton through and through all his life. Mr. Carnegie established a number of Foundations. At least one of them—the College Professors' Pension Fund—seems to be on a line parallel with the Rhodes scholarships. I think it is fair to conclude that he indicated the purpose of this Foundation in a paragraph of his book, "Triumphant Democracy." I quote only the point I wish to emphasize:

"Let men say what they will, I say that as sure as the sun in the heavens once shone on Britons and Americans united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon and greet again the re-united States, the British American Union."³

Am I justified in concluding that a subject treated so seriously by men like Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie cannot be disposed of by a laugh or a wave of the hand? They were both very practical men—farseeing men—and they both make their purpose very clear. If we are not in accord with that purpose we should become active in an endeavor to frustrate it—to prevent its accomplishment.

I now come to a still later, a more serious and a more concrete example of this impudent propaganda intended to de-Americanize our boys and girls.

Every reader of the newspapers is aware that Lord Northcliffe, the owner and publisher of the London Times and a score of other British newspapers, was in charge of British propaganda in the United States during the world war, ably assisted by an efficient lieutenant, Sir Gilbert Parker. They literally filled the American mails with books and pamphlets carefully prepared to inflame the public mind against Germany and in favor of Great Britain.

Just three years ago today—on July 4, 1919—a special American edition of the Times was issued for circulation here and sent to nearly all American newspapers. It contained a lengthy editorial, giving in

³ *Triumphant Democracy*, p. 549.

great detail the method by which British propaganda was to be carried on in this country. I quote from it as follows:

“Efficient propaganda, carried out by those trained in the arts of creating public good-will and of swaying public opinion towards a definite purpose . . . is now needed—urgently needed. To make a beginning: Efficiently organized propaganda should mobilize the press, the church, the stage and the cinema; press into service the whole educational systems of both countries and root the spirit of good will in the homes, the universities, public and high schools and primary schools. It should also provide for subsidizing the best men to write books and articles on special subjects, to be published in cheap editions or distributed free to classes interested.

“Authoritative opinion upon current contraversial topics should be prepared for both the daily press and for magazines; histories and textbooks upon literature should be revised. New books should be added, particularly in the primary schools. Hundreds of exchange university scholarships should be provided. Local societies should be formed in every center to foster British-American good will in close co-operation with an administrative committee. Important articles should be broken up into mouthfuls for popular consumption and booklets, cards, pamphlets, etc., distributed through organized channels to the public.

“Advertising space should be taken in the press, on the boardings and in the street cars for steadily presenting terse, easily read and remembered mind-compelling phrases and easily grasped cartoons that the public may subconsciously absorb the fundamentals of a complete mutual understanding.”⁴

Please note carefully some of the agencies they would use—the press, the church, the stage, the moving pictures and the whole educational systems of both countries, but we hear of nothing being done in any country but our own. They would subsidize the best men to write books which should be published in cheap editions or distributed free. They would revise our school histories and add new ones, particularly in the primary grades. They would advertise in the newspapers, in the street cars and on the billboards; they would keep up these various schemes till the public—that is, the American public—subconsciously

⁴Special American Edition of the *London Times*, July 4, 1919.

The weekly edition of the *London Times* of date August 20, 1920, stated that “the educational movement to increase and cement the friendship between the two countries . . . is making great strides in America.” And as to the motion picture part of the propaganda, it said: “At present, some thirty thousand schools and churches are now exhibiting these educational films.”

absorbed the fundamentals of a complete understanding. In other words, till the American public was thoroughly anglicized. And please don't forget this—they borrowed the money from us to pay for de-nationalizing us. If they succeed it will not be necessary to repay it.

In this same issue of the *Times* there was an article by a de-natured American novelist—who now resides in England—Mr. Owen Wister—in which he said, among other things:

“A movement to correct the school books in the United States has been started. It will go on.”⁵

When Mr. Wister speaks of correcting the school books he means, of course, anglicizing them.

These propagandists say they would press the pulpit, the stage and the moving pictures into service to convince us that we should forget—and teach our children to forget—about our national origin and about the Revolutionary war and the war of 1812 and the Civil war and other things of that sort and, like nice, obliging people, line up behind Mr. John Bull's plan for world dominion.

In some sections of the country, notably in the east, it seems as if they have secured control of a portion of the press. They have a good foothold on the stage and they have made a good start towards capturing the “movies.”

Five American film companies have already been absorbed by British capital and many of the films they produce are distributed free of charge. The *London Times* of September 12, last, stated that 30,000 propaganda films are now being shown in the United States and Sir Gilbert Parker has recently been—perhaps still is—in California supervising the preparation of more propaganda films.^{5a}

But while you may be willing to believe that they can buy advertising space in the newspapers and in the street cars and on the billboards, and that they may get pro-British plays on the stage or pro-British films in the movies, yet you are inclined to think they would not dare to tamper with the histories our children study in the schools. And possibly you think that even if they were bold enough to try that, they could get no American to do such dirty work for them.

If you entertain such a belief, it is, unfortunately, without good foundation. However it has been accomplished, I regret to say there

⁵ From a signed communication in the *London Times*, Special American Edition, July 4, 1919. See also Wister's book *A Square Deal*, or *The Ancient Grudge*.

^{5a} The nature and extent of Sir Gilbert Parker's activities are pretty fully explained by himself in an article in *Harper's Magazine* for March, 1918.

seem to be many Americans who are ready and willing to do this foul and unnatural work.

Again, just a year before the publication of this special edition of the London Times—on July 4, 1918—there was a celebration of the day held in London, at which one of America's leading book publishers, Mr. George Haven Putnam, was present and made an address. Mr. Putnam is the great grandson of General Israel Putnam of Revolutionary fame, but on the occasion referred to, as well as on several other occasions, he apologized for the conduct of his gallant patriot ancestor.

In his address Mr. Putnam said the Fourth of July was a good day to place on record a new declaration. "I want to see," he said, "not a Declaration of Independence, but a Declaration of Interdependence . . . an acknowledgment that the two peoples belong together." In the course of his remarks he also said this: "England's relation to its big offspring might be expressed in the line of the poet Pope:

"We first endure, then pity, then embrace."⁶

Now, Major Putnam is a scholarly man and expresses his thoughts accurately. When he quotes he understands what he quotes, and chooses just the quotation he wants.

Let us examine his quotation from Pope a little closer. He quoted only one line of a sentence which consists of four lines. The whole sentence runs thus:

"Vice is a monster of such frightful mien
That to be hated needs but to be seen.
Yet seen too oft, familiar with its face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

⁶ All the addresses made at this meeting are published in a pamphlet entitled "A Declaration of Interdependence," published in the Library of War Literature, at 511 Fifth Avenue, New York, in 1918, with an introduction by Mr. Putnam.

The quotations given in the address are from pages twenty, twenty-one and twenty-two of this pamphlet. In this address, among other things, he said: "It is now in order to admit that the Loyalists (Tories) had a fair cause to defend, and it was not to be wondered at that many men of the more conservative way of thinking should have convinced themselves that the cause of good government for the Colonies would be better served by maintaining the Royal authority and by improving the Royal methods than by breaking away into the all dubious possibilities of independence." Mr. Putnam's whole address is from a strongly pro-British point of view. It gives one the impression that he considered the United States as a mere convenience or annex to maintain the glory of Great Britain.

Thus you see when he applies the last line to the relations between England and the United States and says, "We first endure, then pity, then embrace," "we" stands for England, and the thing which "we" endure, pity and embrace—that is, "vice"—stands for the United States. "Out of the fullness of the heart, the mouth speaketh."

He also told his English audience that since 1775, American school textbooks and histories "present unhistorical, partisan and often distorted views of our relations with England," and he added, "textbooks are now being prepared which will present a juster historical account of the events from 1775 to 1783, 1812 to 1815, and 1861 to 1865. The writers of these revised—I might say reformed—textbooks will present conclusions in line with those to be found in the history of the American Revolution by Sir George Otto Trevelyan."

He also told them that "The writers of these corrected histories will make clear to the school boys of the coming generation that the American colonies were not fighting against England," "they were fighting," he says, "against a Prussian king."

He also told his audience how he had recently been in Halifax and that he had to apologize to the descendants of some of the men who had in 1776 been forced out of Boston through the illiberal policy of his great grandfather and his associates.

Oh, how I wish someone who has a speaking relation with the spirit world could give us "Old Put's" opinion of his degenerate descendant. I fear we could not trust Conan Doyle to report it accurately.

But after all, Mr. Putnam is only one of a class, and we have the class to deal with. It is quite a large class, too. Aristocracy and the concomitants of royalty seem to make an irresistible appeal to the members of this class, and they appear to feel that the facts in our histories which are disagreeable to the British aristocracy should be modified or entirely eliminated. Then when they visit London, they will not be annoyed by nasty reminders of their ancestors' activities.

I mention Mr. Putnam and Owen Wister merely as examples. They are by no means the only ones who seem to think that the Revolutionary war was a mistake, and that the fathers of the Republic were a rather sorry lot, whom we should try to forget.

If this doctrine were preached only to grown folks, it would be bad enough, but printing it in the school histories from which our boys and girls get their impressions of the men who won our independence and framed our government is a crime of the worst character. It is both weak and wicked to deprive our children of the fine ideals they have in our national heroes—in Samuel Adams, in Prescott, in Warren, in Wayne, and Stark, and Otis; in Patrick Henry,

Richard Henry Lee, Paul Jones and John Barry, not to mention such Titans as Hancock, Franklin, Jefferson, and Washington.

What do you really think of putting into the hands of our children, histories which ignore or belittle these men to whom we owe so much—to whom the world owes so much; whose example we want our children to emulate; whose memory we want them to revere?

Here is a partial list of such books as have come to my knowledge, which are being used as textbooks and as reference books in the public and private schools of the country, books which either ignore, or besmire and belittle our national heroes. Nearly all of them have been published since this propaganda invasion became pronounced. Whether there is a logical connection between these facts, I am not prepared to say, but the coincidence is certainly very suggestive:

A History of the United States for Schools, by McLaughlin and Van Tyne, published in 1919.

History of the American People, by Willis Mason West.

American History for Grades (two books), by Everett Barnes, published in 1920.

Our United States History, by Charles J. Gitteau, published in 1919.

The American Revolution in Our School Textbooks, by Charles Altschul.

School History of the United States, by John P. O'Hara, published in 1919.

The Book of American Wars, by Helen Nicolay, published in 1918.

Introduction to Burke's Speech on Conciliation, by C. H. Ward.
Muzzey's History of the United States, 1917.

School History of the United States, by Albert Bushnell Hart, published in 1920.

There are a number of other books more or less objectionable, but these will suffice to illustrate the points I wish to make.

I cannot, of course, take the time to go into details as to each one of them. Some are just bad and others are worse. Some of them sin by what they say; others sin by what they omit. They all sin in one way or the other, most of them in both ways.

To illustrate, I mention at the outset the textbook in use in the Springfield high school—Professor Hart's "History of the United States." The edition in use here was published in 1917 and is not so objectionable as a later revised edition, published in 1920. The excuse for a new edition so soon is that the World war made it necessary to bring the book down to date, but the World war did not make it neces-

sary to go back to the Revolutionary period to revise former chapters and add new ones, as the author does in the latest edition.

In dealing with the causes of the Revolutionary war, Professor Hart says:

"To this day, it is not easy to see just why the Colonists felt so dissatisfied."⁷

What a misleading statement to make to boys and girls!

I submit that it is quite easy to see why they were dissatisfied, and any American who cannot see it is hardly qualified to write a school history for our children to study.

Here is a brief statement of reasons given in a school history which was in common use many years ago, and which I used both as a student and as a teacher.

It contains only 292 pages, whereas Professor Hart's book has 652 pages and the 1920 edition is still larger. If this small book has room for a list of reasons, surely Hart's book ought to have room for one. I quote from Barnes' History, published in 1877:

"England treated the settlers as an inferior class of people. Her intention was to make and keep the Colonies dependent. The laws were all framed to favor the English manufacturer and merchant at the expense of the Colonist. The navigation acts compelled the American farmer to send all his products across the ocean to England and to buy all his goods in British markets. American manufactures were prohibited. Iron works were denounced as common nuisances. William Pitt, the friend of America, declared that "she had no right to manufacture even a nail for a horseshoe.

"The exportation of hats from one colony to another was prohibited and no hatter could have more than two apprentices.

"The people of the Carolinas were forbidden to cut down the pine trees in their vast forests in order to convert the wood into staves or the juice into turpentine or tar for commercial purposes. All commerce, even that between the different colonies, had to be carried in British ships with British captains and British crews."⁸

⁷ Hart. Chapter 8, page 126. On the same page, Professor Hart says the Colonists were so free they could not understand why they should be under any restraint. In this he differs very radically with Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration, and John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman and Robert Livingston, who, with Jefferson, constituted the committee that reported the Declaration to the Continental Congress. According to Professor Hart, they had very little foundation for the indictment they drew in the Declaration of Independence. Shall the pupil believe Hart or Jefferson and the Committee?

⁸ Barnes' *Brief History*, Edition of 1877, pages 101, 102, and note. This

And this is only a partial list of reasons.

The Declaration of Independence is printed in Hart's book, and he admits it states twenty-seven reasons for dissatisfaction, but there are none so blind as those who will not see.

Describing the battle of Lexington, Hart says: "It is uncertain just how the fight began,"⁹ and he contents himself by giving only the version of an English officer who was present.

Now there is no uncertainty at all about how the fight began. Lossing, Hildreth, Bancroft, Higginson, Fiske, Hawthorne, and indeed every American writer worthy of credit, who has dealt with the subject, are in no doubt as to how the fight began. They all agree that it began when Major Pitcairn, the British officer in command—enraged at the minute men because they refused to disperse—drew his pistol, aimed it, fired it, and then ordered his men to fire, which most of them did, killing eight Americans.

Why does Mr. Hart throw a cloud of doubt around an important fact about which there is no doubt? Why leave our school children in doubt as to where the blame lay when there is no doubt the blame was on the British.

In speaking of the author of the Declaration of Independence, Mr. Hart slyly informs the boys and girls that "some Federalists looked on Thomas Jefferson as an atheist, a liar, and a demagogue."¹⁰ He adds a half-hearted explanation which does not explain at all, and so the boys and girls will go out into the world with this catch-phrase clinging like a burr in their memory, suggesting to them that the author of the Declaration of Independence was "an atheist, a liar, and a demagogue." Can the student be blamed if this statement causes him to doubt the sincerity of Jefferson, and of the men who were closely associated with him in the great work? And what particular benefit can Professor Hart think he is conferring on the children by the insertion of this piece of malicious political gossip.

history was written by Professor Steele and published by A. S. Barnes & Co., and must be carefully distinguished from the Barnes' *History* referred to hereafter, written by Everett Barnes.

⁹ Hart's *New American History*, page 135.

¹⁰ Hart's *History of the United States Revised*, Section 150.

McLaughlin and Van Tyne tell of a toast drunk by certain voters in Connecticut: "Thomas Jefferson; may he receive from his fellow-citizens the reward of his merit—a halter."

While this may have happened, it is at best only an evidence of the bitterness of his political opponents, and is certainly out of place in a school textbook.

On the question of who was to blame for the starting of the war, another book which, if not in use as a textbook, in Springfield, is used as a reference book—Muzzey's *History of the United States*—tells the children:

"There are differences of opinion as to who was responsible on the American side for the outbreak of the war, some scholars hold that the Revolution was 'the work of an unscrupulous and desperate minority headed by firebrands like Patrick Henry and Sam Adams.'"¹¹

I wonder who are these "some scholars?" I wonder how many of them there are? Just two would meet his description of "some scholars." I wonder what weight their opinion is entitled to? Mr. Muzzey does not tell us what his own opinion is. He leaves the children to decide whether they will accept the insinuation as to what "some scholars" think.

Do you suppose that he thought he was helping to build up good citizenship by suggesting to the boys and girls who study his book, that the Revolution was "the work of an unscrupulous and desperate minority," and that Patrick Henry and Sam Adams were mere firebrands, fit leaders for "an unscrupulous and desperate minority?" What good could the author think he was doing to the children, or to the country, by publishing such a statement—such a false and misleading statement—in a school history?

Are you willing to have our children think of Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry as firebrands? Why do you suppose this man wants to chill the patriotic enthusiasm of American boys and girls by suggesting that we owe the republic to an unscrupulous and desperate minority led by firebrands?

But Hart and Muzzey are by no means the worst offenders. West, McLaughlin and Van Tyne, Everett Barnes and Gitteau and Ward outdo them in the attempt to besmirch the Revolutionary heroes and belaud the English.

Without attempting to give details, I quote some of the descriptions which these authors give of the brave, liberty-loving men of '76.

Barnes tells us that John Hancock was a smuggler, and that his father had been a smuggler.¹²

¹¹ Muzzey's *History*, Edition 1917, page 128.

McLaughlin & Van Tyne call Patrick Henry "A gay, unprosperous and hitherto unknown country lawyer" (page 141). Why "gay"? Is it to belittle? And is it impossible to be patriotic and "unprosperous?"

¹² Barnes' *History*, part 2, page 9.

McLaughlin and Van Tyne describe John Hancock as "the prince of smugglers," page 140.

He says: "The Second Continental Congress was a scene of petty bickerings and schemings. . . . There was a scramble for honors and for offices. In that congress were selfish, unworthy, short-sighted, narrow-minded, office-seeking, and office-trading plotters, just as there have been in every congress ever since."¹³

What a fine characterization to place before our children of the men who adopted and signed the great Declaration, who risked everything, even their lives, for the public good; who accomplished the greatest task set before a legislative body. The congress included such men as John Hancock, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Samuel Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Charles Carroll of Carrollton; Matthew Thornton, Roger Sherman. George Taylor, Richard Henry Lee, Edward Rutledge, Thomas Lynch, Button Gwinnett, and the others whose names you heard read a while ago as the signers of the Declaration.

Is the man who cannot see the wonderful courage and foresight and achievements of this great body, and who can only see the blots and blurs and the shortcomings of its members—is such a man fit to write the history of their time and of the country they established, and especially the history to be used in the schools of the country? Are we justified in tolerating the use of histories which make a specialty of lying, both by omission and commission—of slandering the men to whom we owe so much?

I particularly despise this man Everett Barnes, because I cannot help contrasting him and his work with the writer of the Barnes' Brief History, of which I have spoken and with which I was so familiar, both as student and as teacher—a history which was so full of the spirit of real Americanism. I can hardly ward off a suggestion which persists in coming to me that the popularity of the old Barnes has been used as a cloak to camouflage the propaganda of the new and spurious Barnes.

This perverter of the facts of American history ignores Nathan Hale altogether. He seems not to have heard of Faneuil Hall, the cradle of American liberty. At least he does not mention it. He ignores the Boston massacre; he ignores the quartering of British troops upon the people; he consigns Ethan Allen and Anthony Wayne to oblivion, but he takes a page to defend Benedict Arnold, the traitor, whom he tells the children congress had not treated fairly.¹⁴

¹³ Barnes' *History*, part 2, page 34.

¹⁴ See also McLaughlin & Van Tyne, page 187. They say of Arnold, "All his bravery and energy in the American cause had been ignored by the American Congress." This is untrue, and would seem to be intended as an apology for Arnold's treason.

Surely if this book is not intended as propaganda it is a very remarkable coincidence that it complies so fully with the outline laid down by Lord Northcliffe and endorsed by Mr. Putnam, Owen Wister and other denatured Americans.

Take, for instance, his description of the battle of Bunker Hill, one of the most dramatic scenes in history. This battle offers to the historian an opportunity to tell American boys and girls a thrilling story of bravery and determination without departing in the least from the exact truth.

There were a thousand Americans without military experience or training—peasants, the British general contemptuously called them—armed with such weapons as they happened to possess, not over one in ten having a bayonet on his gun, and with less than three rounds of ammunition. They worked hard through the hot June night and through the hotter day till mid-afternoon digging trenches. They were without food to eat, and without water to drink, for the enemy's artillery had destroyed the casks in which their drinking water was stored.

These untrained citizens were attacked by an army of the best-drilled, best-armed, best-equipped troops in the world, fresh from many European victories. And the attacking force outnumbered the Colonials about three to one. Twice these brave minute men smashed the lines of the attacking army and drove them back in utter rout. Their ammunition being exhausted, they were forced to retire before the third attack. But they retired in such good order that they were not even pursued. The number of the enemy's casualties exceeded the entire number of the Colonial forces.

What a subject for a narrative that would cause the nerves of the normal American boy to tingle, that would fill both boys and girls with pride to be the citizens of a government founded by such men.

But all that this degenerate American historian can get out of the situation is to tell our children that "British pluck triumphed,"¹⁵ a statement which can properly be characterized only by the use of "a short and ugly word."

With these alleged historians, the Boston Massacre was merely "justifiable resistance to a mob."^{15a} The Boston Tea Party, which was

¹⁵ McLaughlin and Van Tyne, Vol. I, page 1.

^{15a} Miss Nicolay calls the Boston Massacre "a mere street brawl begun by citizens who annoyed some passing soldiers," page 82.

Professor Hart devotes four lines to it and says the name "Boston Massacre" applied to the unfortunate affair is "unsuitable," and this in the face of the fact

a magnificent defiance of tyranny, they daintily describe as "an act of violence."¹⁶

Major Andre, the British spy, they describe as "a fine young man for whom everyone felt pity,"¹⁷ but Nathan Hale, the American, they consign to oblivion by not mentioning at all. If the student wishes to learn anything about this young hero who, with the noose around his neck, proudly declared that he regretted he had only one life to lose for his country, he will have to look somewhere else for it.

The war of 1812 is dealt with in the same spirit. If the Americans won a sea fight—as they always did when the conditions were nearly equal—some accident in their favor accounts for the victory, but whoever won or lost, there are always encomiums for "British pluck."

Jackson's victory at New Orleans is belittled thus: "All that it was necessary for the Americans to do, to win a victory, was to hold their ground." For that, it seems they deserved no praise, anyway, they get none. But the British! Ah, that's different. Here's the way their praises are sung: "The invaders came on like British soldiers, and like British soldiers they came again and again."¹⁸ Could you blame a boy who admires courage, if after reading these things in his school history, he said to himself, "Gee, I wish I was an Englishman instead of being an American."

And then as if to belittle the American victory and rob the victors of all glory, the historian falsely says: "It was a wasted battle, a needless victory." Not a word about the facts of the battle, facts which would fill a healthy boy with joy and pride that he, too, is an American.

You are probably familiar with the facts. You no doubt recall that at the battle of New Orleans, the British General had ten thousand of the finest troops in Europe, the conquerors of Napoleon's legions, perfectly equipped, perfectly confident, and led by experienced officers.

These 10,000 were opposed by twenty-two hundred Americans, of whom only eight hundred were regulars, the other fourteen hundred

that armed troops fired on unarmed civilians, killing five of them. Barnes does not mention it at all.

¹⁶ McLaughlin and Van Tyne, Vol. 1, page 149.

¹⁷ Morris' *Elementary History*.

Miss Nicolay gives a page and a half to Andre whom she describes as "young and gifted, a man of great personal charm," etc. She gives four and a half lines to Nathan Hale.

¹⁸ Barnes' *Grammar Grades*, Section 328. Also Barnes' *History*, page 261, describing the battle of New Orleans.

being untrained, untried militia. But the British ranks literally withered away before the deadly fire of these American boys who won a most wonderful and a most decisive victory. But that fact must be kept out of the "reformed" school books.

You will also recall that Lord Northcliffe's propaganda plan included the subsidizing—that is the hiring, or bribing—of the best men to write books, to revise our old histories and to write new ones. Let me remind you that most of these unhistoric histories have been published since Northcliffe's plan was promulgated.

In the book of American wars, which is used mostly as a reference work, Miss Nicolay describes James Otis as "the great incendiary from New England";¹⁹ James Warren as "the man who invented the committees of correspondence who were spreading discontent over the land,"²⁰ and Patrick Henry as "a slovenly, fiddle-playing incompetent, with an odd gift of oratory."²¹ Franklin, she sends to the scrap heap thus: "But everyone knew Franklin, his was the eccentricity of genius."²²

She tells American boys—to whom she dedicates her book—"It seems impossible to believe that eight hundred British regulars could have been routed so easy by untrained farmers. Presumably," she says, "the soldiers were obeying orders not to rouse the country side."²³ Presumably, too, Miss Nicolay was thinking of a visit to London.

These writers all seem to have a peculiar aversion for John Hancock. They tell us Hancock was a smuggler, and his father was also a smuggler, and that smuggling was a crime, leaving the student to infer that John Hancock was a criminal. They tell us he stole away from Lexington across the fields in the early morning, as the British soldiers were coming, thus suggesting to the students that Hancock was also a coward. But General Gage did not regard Hancock as a coward. He regarded Hancock and Sam Adams as arch rebels. He offered to pardon everybody but these two. Is that why the de-natured historians delight in abusing them?

¹⁹ Miss Nicolay, page 74.

²⁰ *Ib.*

²¹ *Ib.*, page 75.

²² *Ib.* page 75.

²³ After naming Samuel Adams, James Otis, James Warren, Benjamin Franklin and Patrick Henry, Miss Nicolay comments thus: "If the country had to choose between government by such a rabble and government from England, conservative and well-to-do Tories preferred the one three thousand miles away," page 75.

In truth, as you know, Hancock and Adams were men of great courage and bravery, and it is a shameful perversion of the truth of history to represent them otherwise.

What do you suppose is Mr. West's purpose in telling our school boys and girls that "most of the settlers were servants and a rather worthless lot, with the vices of an irresponsible, untrained, hopeless class. . . . Cheats and drunkards."²⁴ Or this: Democracy is the meanest and worst form of government."²⁵ Or this: "At the capture of Quebec, General Wolfe had only seven hundred Americans, whom he described as the dirtiest, most contemptible, cowardly, dogs. . . . such rascals as are an encumbrance to an army."²⁶

In all conscience, I ask, is this stuff put into the hands of American children with the intent to make them good, loyal, law-abiding citizens of the Republic, or is it intended to fill them with contempt for everything American, and to make them long for the time when they can become British subjects?

The real—the basic—justification for a system of free schools is, that general intelligence is necessary to preserve government of the people by the people. The state has as much right—even more right—to preserve its existence as the individual has, but if the state permits the teaching of false history to the children in its schools—history which is calculated to poison their minds against the state—then may not the state be fairly accused of trying to commit suicide?

I might go on quoting instances of bald misstatements, which appear to have been made deliberately, which can have no good effect, and which can hardly fail to have a bad effect on the minds of the young people who study them. You may take even Washington himself—whom the world recognizes as the soul of honor and patriotism—tell the children only of his weaknesses, emphasize them unduly, dwell on them with ridicule and with sneers; then slur over his virtues, admit that "some scholars" think he had good qualities, and from

²⁴ West's *History of the American People*," page 67.

²⁵ *Ib.*, page 72.

²⁶ *Ib.*, page 182.

West's *History* attributes mean and sordid motives to many—I might almost say, most—of the leaders of the Revolution: "George Washington had been refused a commission in the British army; Sam Adams' father had been ruined by a wise British veto of a proposed bank; the older Otis failed to get a judicial appointment he wanted; Hamilton was a briefless and penniless law student looking for troubled water to fish in," page 195.

Much of the matter in West's book reads like the fulminations of a "soap box" orator. It may have a fitting place somewhere, but its place is not in the hands of American school children.

such a distorted picture, the student would inevitably form a mean, or at best, a very indifferent, opinion of George Washington.

That is the course which many of these writers pursue. "British Liberty," "British Law," "British Pluck," are kept constantly before the student's mind, while things creditable to America are omitted or slurred, or belittled, or falsified.

But, you say, if the case is as bad as you make it appear, surely somebody would call public attention to it, something would be doing to counteract it.

As a matter of fact, public attention has been called to it, and is being called. New York and Boston and Philadelphia and other cities in the East have been giving it a great deal of attention. Mr. Charles Grant Miller, the author of the pamphlet I have referred to, has written much, and ably, about it, and many other well-informed and patriotic persons have called public attention to it.

Mr. Wallace McCamant, the president general of the Sons of the American Revolution, has spoken bravely on the subject in the public press, and the great order of which he is the head, at its last annual meeting, passed vigorous resolutions denouncing it, and President Harding has commended their good work.

In a letter to the New York American, President McCamant says among many other good things:

"I seek to inculcate no prejudice against Great Britain. I would have every school history make clear that George III has been dead for more than a hundred years.

"But I am in accord with Charles Grant Miller in his contention that our American histories should have an American background; that the story of the American revolution should be told with fidelity to the facts, with emphasis on the righteousness of our forefathers' cause and with colorful portrayal of the heroic achievements and the patient spirit of sacrifice, through which our political privileges were won.

"What think you of a school history which begins the story of the American revolution with this sentence:

"'There is little use trying to learn whose fault it was how the war began, for, as we have seen such a long train of events led to disagreement between England and America, that we should have to go back and back to the very founding of the colonies. As in most quarrels, the blame is laid by each party on the other.' . . .

"Another author of a school history, in discussing taxation without representation, says:

“ ‘There was here an honest difference of opinion, and as neither party to the dispute would give way, a conflict was inevitable.’

“The man who has not found out who was right and who was wrong in the controversy which culminated at Lexington and Concord has certainly not been called of God to write American history.

“Shall we permit our children to be taught that the American Revolution was an unnecessary war, that after the lapse of a century there is doubt about who was right?

“One school history denounces the Boston Tea Party as a ‘lawless destruction of property,’ another as a ‘violent act viewed with great anger in England.’

“One history refers to John Hancock as a smuggler and the son of a smuggler. Except for a reference to the desire of the British authorities to capture and punish him there is no other reference in the book to this man who signed his name to the Declaration of Independence in letters so large that George III could read them without his spectacles.”²⁷

At the last national meeting of the Sons of the American Revolution, the following resolution was adopted:

“The Sons of the American Revolution, in national congress assembled, express their deep interest in the subject of textbooks on American history in use in our public schools. We protest against the use of any textbook which lauds the Tories and censures the Patriots, which maligns the memory of any of the great men of the Revolutionary period, or undervalues the service and sacrifices by which our national independence was won.

“Textbooks on American history should be written only by those who are in sympathy with the principles for which our forefathers fought. Every such history should adequately stress the story of the American Revolution, portray in colorful outline the heroic incidents of the struggle, and teach the priceless institutions which we inherit from our forefathers?”

Nor is this all. Protests against these textbooks were so loud and so frequent that Mr. Ettinger, superintendent of schools in New York city, appointed a committee of twenty-three school principals and teachers to examine the charges made against the histories in use in the schools there. This committee has been giving the matter very thorough consideration. The New York World of May 16th stated that they had concluded their work but would not give out the result till their report was printed in pamphlet form and ready for distribution. I dare say a letter to Dr. William L. Ettinger, superintendent

of schools, New York city, would bring further information about this committee's report, and possibly a copy of it.

The World correspondent said that Superintendent Ettinger did not deny that the books of West, McLaughlin & Van Tyne, Gitteau, Everett Barnes, Hart, Ward and a number of others, are among those which will be condemned and banned.

Is there any connection between the foreign propaganda I have referred to and this falsification of American history? Is Cecil Rhodes' secret society at work here? Is it getting help from the Rhodes graduates? Are the Carnegie Foundations doing their bit in an effort to bring about the morning when the sun "is to rise, shine upon, and greet again the Re-United States, the British American Union?"

Have these denatured histories any connection with Lord Northcliffe's plan to provide for subsidizing the best men to write books, to revise old histories, and to write new ones, especially for the primary grades?

I cannot say. I don't know; but if it is all a mere coincidence, it is a very striking one.

We are told it is very important that United States and Great Britain should live in peace and maintain cordial relations.

I cheerfully agree with that view. I believe that America wants to live in peace with Great Britain. War between the United States and Great Britain would be even a greater calamity than the late World war, but in my judgment this way of British propaganda is not the way to peace; it is rather the way to war.

I believe that any attempt to carry out the plans of Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie, and some de-natured Americans who are ashamed of their country and their ancestors, who appear to like the aristocratic form of English society better than the democratic form of American society—I say, any attempt by these to carry out such a purpose is a very sure way to interrupt peace between the two countries.

The American people are a big, broad, generous-minded, good-natured people. They act in the open, in good faith, and they give credit to others for doing likewise, but let no one forget that this is America, and when aroused our people are Americans through and through, and no nation, no race, can strengthen the bonds between us and it by attempting, through propaganda or intrigue, to swallow us, or to submerge our national consciousness.

We stand unalterably for that independence which the glorious men of '76 won for us. Woe to any nation that attempts to rob us of it! Shame to any American who would sap the foundations of it!

In spite of propaganda, or intrigue, or force, or treachery, we take our stand with Washington and Jefferson and Franklin and Hancock and Adams and the other heroes of that time; and here, within the shadow of the tomb of Lincoln, in this beautiful park which bears his honored name, we pledge our unswerving devotion to their memory, and our undying loyalty to the republic they bequeathed us.

Springfield, Illinois.

JAMES M. GRAHAM.

THE ILLINOIS PART OF THE DIOCESE OF VINCENNES

(Continued from July, 1922, Number)

REV. FRANCIS JOSEPH FISCHER

In a recent issue of the ILLINOIS CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW a sketch was published of the life and labors of Rev. Francis Joseph Fischer, who spent some very active years in Chicago as Assistant Pastor of St. Mary's Church. With the data available at that time Father Fischer's career was traced to the Fall of 1848, when he left Madison, Indiana, and it was stated that all trace of the good priest was then lost. Since that time through the diligent efforts of Father Schwarz and the courtesy of Rev. Anthony Kiefer of Stringtown, Illinois, and Rev. P. J. Virnich, Rector at Ste. Marie, Illinois, we are enabled to trace Father Fischer to the time of his death.

The solution of the difficulty of following Father Fischer's career lies in the fact that he transferred from the diocese of Vincennes to the diocese of Chicago. He was received into the Chicago diocese on October 5, 1848, and was shortly thereafter placed in charge of the Piquet settlement of Alsations, in Jasper County, Illinois, which place still bears the name Ste. Marie (McGovern's Catholic Church in Chicago, Silver Jubilee of Archbishop Feehan, p. 91. This work also mentions Father Fischer on pages 113, 149, 150).

Rev. J. B. Chasse had visited the place from Vincennes in August, 1848, a few months before Father Fischer became resident pastor of the parish.

Under Father Fischer the first brick church at Ste. Marie was built. It was commenced in 1849, and blessed in 1850, and served its purpose until Easter Monday, 1891.

During the early years of this settlement Mt. Carmel, Bridgeport, Fairfield, Newton, Olney, St. Wendel, Stringtown, and at times also St. Francisville received spiritual attendance from Ste. Marie. The Catholics from Coles and Clay Counties used to bring their children to Ste. Marie for baptism. When the Ohio and Mississippi railroad was built Ste. Marie priests went all along the line to attend the religious needs of the Catholic workmen. (Virnich's account of Ste. Marie in an Atlas of Jasper County, Illinois.)

There are some very interesting notations on the Stringtown parish records. In 1850 Father Fischer wrote in the German language that

he had donated the statue of St. Joseph, the altar cards, and some other things for the altar, and that whilst the Bishop of Chicago paid \$4.85 for the station pictures, the Bishop of Vincennes gave an altar stone. He further noted that for his support the congregation paid him \$40.00 for the year 1850, and \$50.00 for the year 1853. In 1852 he blessed the cemetery and its large crucifix.

In 1855 Father Fischer removed to Waterloo, Illinois, where he remained until 1861, after which he returned to the place of his birth, Alsace.

In 1888 Rev. P. J. Virnich, present rector of Ste. Marie, Illinois, visited Alsace and called at the parochial residence of Father Fischer, but did not find him at home. He was an active pastor, however, and continued his ministrations until his death, which occurred in 1893.

Thus we have a brief outline of this good priest, who, by his zeal and diligence, endeared himself to so many Chicagoans of a very early day.

RT. REV. MSGR. JULIAN BENOIT, V. G.

When Bishop Bruté visited France in search of recruits for his diocese and came to Lyons in 1836, he was much surprised to meet a young man who offered him his services without being asked. It was the talented Benoit, a deacon and professor at the Grand Seminary. "You," the saintly Bishop Bruté told him, "are a spoiled child; you will never do for the missions in America; you are accustomed to all comforts; you have such a beautiful position, but in America, I can offer you nothing but corn bread and bacon, and not enough of that. There will be many a night when you will have no shelter, many a night when you will have no bed, many a day and night when you will have to be on horseback through the wilderness." Father Benoit merely answered, "Monseigneur, if you can do it, why cannot I? If you can make a sacrifice and do it for the love of God, why should not I, a young man, be able to do it?" "Well, then, come in the name of God," the holy bishop said, and he did come.

Having obtained his exeat he bade farewell to his parents in their mountain home at Septmoncel, diocese of St. Claude, where he was born October 17, 1808, and sailed to America.

He came to this country in 1836 and remained at first with the Sulpitians at Baltimore to study the English language and was ordained April 24, 1837.

Father Benoit's first charge was the Assumption parish at Evansville, Indiana, where he remained five months. He next spent a year

establishing missions in Perry County, Indiana, and then was sent to Chicago to assist Father O'Meara. As most of his time was devoted to the faithful at Lockport, Joliet and several other canal towns, it is probable that the Catholics of Chicago hardly knew him, for he seems unmentioned in the chronicles there.

After laboring on the Illinois missions from the fall of 1838 to May, 1839, he was called and sent back to Perry County.¹

Father Benoit on first coming here in 1837 was the first priest to reside in the county. It was at Derby, an old mission visited since 1823 by Father Elisha Durbin of Kentucky, and who in 1824 built St. Mary's log church (at Derby), the first Catholic church erected along the Ohio river in Indiana.²

That whole section of the county then went under the name of Rome, as given in Bishop Bruté's pen sketch map shown at p. 256, Vol. IV., of the ILLINOIS CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW. The county in general was yet a primeval forest with panthers, catamounts and other wild animals roaming about. Here in the back country Father Benoit found Catholics, some of whom had not seen a priest for many years and whose children were wondering what a priest looked like.

His record of baptisms, all written in English began with October 22, 1837, and is still at hand.

When "at home" Father Benoit lodged in the church. He had no parsonage and if he had it would have been used only at intervals, for he was constantly forming new missions farther away from the church, even into the adjoining county. His principal missions from Derby were: Troy, St. John, Leopold, Mt. Pleasant, Fredonia and Leavenworth. He was at home everywhere with the pioneer settlers, and as poor as they were they made him partake of their frugal hospitality, he sharing in their "corn bread and bacon, and not enough of that," just as Bishop Bruté foretold in France. The panic of 1837 was raging. Money was scarce and the people had none to give. They lived scattered and far apart, and at times the poor missionary would get lost in the trackless forest where alone with his Indian pony he had to spend the night in the open. He quietly endured untold hardship and occasionally was in need of the bare necessities of life.

Probably Bishop Bruté, when hearing how he was being affected by the strenuous life in the wilderness here, thought it would be a relief for him to be sent awhile to Chicago.

¹ *History of the Catholic Church in Indiana*, pp. 190-193.

² *Bessonier's Reminiscences in Alerding's Hist. Dioc. Vin.*, pp. 499-494.

After his return from the Illinois mission in 1839 things were more comfortable in Perry County, in that he for once had his own home. During his absence Bishop Bruté had a small combination church and parsonage erected for him at Leopold near the center of Perry County, which had become the center of many missions. This church was always called "The Chapel." It was a two-story frame, 20 by 30 feet, having two rooms below for residence and the floor above for the chapel, with a very steep stairway outside to climb into it. People always dreaded that stairway, especially in wet weather or when covered by snow, for often some rolled down the stairs before they could reach the top.

From Leopold all missions now radiated and it became much easier to attend them. But Father Benoit did not remain long to enjoy those improvements.³

On April 16, 1840, he was removed to the small town of Fort Wayne, where he was destined for an eventful career lasting 45 years.⁴

All he had in the line of church property was an unfinished frame church, rudely built, not plastered, with rough boards for benches, and what was worse, a debt resting on it of \$4,307.

He was the only priest in northeastern Indiana with missions scattered over that vast territory where sick calls ranged up to 80 or more miles. He also preached in Indian villages through an interpreter.

As the labor was too great for one priest an assistant was sent him. His first school opened in 1845, taught by Sisters of Providence.

Continual immigration caused many changes; Fort Wayne became a large city and many new towns arose on all sides. In 1857 Fort Wayne became an Episcopal see and Father Benoit lived to see Catholicity flourishing with many churches and schools and religious and charitable institutions where one time he was the only priest.

Pope Leo XIII in 1883 conferred on him the honor and title of monsignor. Father Benoit had a kindly, genial disposition and was honored and loved by both clergy and people for his many charitable deeds. He devoted himself to the duties of his position of Vicar-general and pastor of the Cathedral with great zeal until November, 1884. Becoming afflicted with cancer of the throat he prepared for death with a deliberate spirit of resignation. "If Providence desires to take me by the throat," he jocosely remarked, "then God's will be done." He was cheerful and contented in knowing that death was

³ Information about Father Benoit's life was obtained from old pioneers of that section.

⁴ *History of the Catholic Church in Indiana*, pp. 193 to 211.

nigh and that he had time to prepare for it. He would not ask God to relieve him of it and the suffering he took as a welcome penance. When he must have suffered intense agony it was impossible to perceive it—he concealed his pain. As soon as he knew that he was fatally sick he received the last sacraments. He died peacefully and calmly on the eve of his patron saint's feast, January 26, 1885, aged 76 years, 3 months and 9 days. His remains lie at rest in the Fort Wayne Cathedral, where his epitaph on a slab in the floor shows the place.

It was his last request: "Bury me in the Cathedral, outside the sanctuary railing, that in death, as I was in life, I may be among the people whom I loved."

REV. HIPPOLYTE DUPONTAVICE

Father Dupontavice, who had charge of Joliet and other missions, was born in France in the year 1810. He was ordained a deacon before coming to America and arrived at Vincennes, Indiana, October 21, 1839. With him on the voyage were John Gueguen and Francis Joseph Fischer, both of whom were destined to serve on the Illinois missions.⁵

He was the first priest ordained by Bishop Hailandière, on November 30, 1839, and in December following was appointed pastor of Joliet, Illinois. He left Vincennes in a spring wagon covered with canvas, drawn by two horses, having for his companion the Rev. Maurice de St. Palais, who had been appointed pastor of Chicago. Dresden and Corktown were his missions in 1842,⁶ and Father Gueguen was with him at Joliet a year from 1840.⁷

Father Dupontavice labored in Illinois until 1844, when he was recalled and sent to St. Simon's, then a small parish at Washington, Daviess County,⁸ some nineteen miles east of Vincennes. He also visited St. Patrick's mission in the same county. The Catholics of Daviess County all liked him, for he was gay and lively, and was full of energy, and used it all for the welfare of his people.⁹

During his three years' stay at Washington he had been Superior of the Seminary at Vincennes, "but when Bishop Hailandière resigned

⁵ Alerding—*Hist. of Diocese of Vincennes*, pp. 488-491.

⁶ ILLINOIS CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, Vol. 1, p. 337.

⁷ Alerding, p. 451.

⁸ Alerding p. 353.

⁹ Old Catholic newspaper clippings.

in 1847 and Bishop Bazin succeeded him Father Dupontavice declined to be Superior any longer."¹⁰ This led to Father St. Palais being called to Vincennes and made Vicar-General and Superior of the seminary.

Father Dupontavice became Rev. St. Palais' immediate successor as pastor of St. Michael's Church in Madison, Indiana, where he held charge for nearly twenty-seven years, up to his lamented death.¹¹

At North Madison, a suburb of Madison, he built a brick church in 1853 and with it began to exist and flourish St. Patrick's congregation, which he visited until 1875.¹² He procured the first Catholic cemetery for Madison and built on it a mortuary chapel.¹³

From 1848 to 1852 he was Vicar-General of the diocese and in 1849 was one of the two assistants when Bishop St. Palais was consecrated.

Father Dupontavice was the soul of every enterprise that tended to benefit religion; and being of a noble and generous disposition he became endeared to the hearts of all that came in contact with him. He was called to his eternal reward on May 27, 1874, aged 64 years.¹⁴

His funeral was attended by an immense crowd of people who went in procession to the cemetery at North Madison, where he was gently laid to rest in the mortuary chapel, which he himself had erected some years before.¹⁵

It is desired to go into the work of Father Dupontavice in Illinois more fully and for this purpose it is necessary to examine the archives of the churches at Joliet, Lockport and other points. The result of these investigations will appear in subsequent issues.

Chicago.

JOSEPH J. THOMPSON.

¹⁰ Alerding, p. 501.

¹¹ Alerding, p. 353.

¹² *Ib.*, p. 373.

¹³ *Ib.*, p. 353.

¹⁴ *Ib.*, p. 353.

¹⁵ I made a note in my *Alerding History* many years ago stating: "Concerning Father Dupontavice see 'An Apostolic Woman,' pp. 296 to 298."

I don't remember the nature of that reference and no longer have the book. Perhaps you have a copy or can easily obtain it at a library. Maybe you will find something worth while. The same book also gives an account of Bishop Bazin's death, pp. 298-305.

EDITOR—I do not find the book referred to by Father Schwarz. Will readers try to locate it?

POINTS IN ILLINOIS HISTORY

In the January number, 1922, we began the publication of a symposium dealing with several mooted questions on Illinois history.

The proposal for a study of the several questions propounded struck a popular chord, and the very ablest students of history in this part of the world responded immediately to the suggestion for a discussion.

The ILLINOIS CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW is under renewed obligations to Rev. Gilbert J. Garraghan, S. J., and Rev. Lawrence J. Kenny, S. J., of the St. Louis University, for opening the discussion. In the July number a very able paper from the pen of Mr. Milo Milton Quaife, the noted historian of the Northwest, was published.

It had been the intention of Dr. Clarence Walworth Alvord, the editor in chief of the Centennial History of Illinois, and a leading authority on Mid-West history, to prepare a paper on the points raised, but instead Dr. Alvord writes as follows:

“Joseph J. Thompson, Esquire,
917 Ashland Block,
Chicago, Illinois.

My dear Mr. Thompson:

It was my intention to prepare an article for your ‘Symposium on Illinois History,’ but since reading my good friend, Doctor Quaife, on the subject, I do not find that I have anything to add. Quaife has gone at the subject in his usual careful manner and seems to have left very little ground for me to work over.

There is, in your Symposium, one point on which Mr. Quaife did not expand, and that is the movement of the Kaskaskia and Peoria tribes. In regard to this, I have had my say in my volume, THE ILLINOIS COUNTRY, and what I have said has already been discussed learnedly in your magazine. It seems to me that Father Kenny’s hypothesis is quite possible—in fact very probable—that the Kaskaskia stopped for some time on the Missouri side of the river before going to the village of Kaskaskia.

It has always been difficult for me to explain why there has been preserved so little information concerning the village of Kaskaskia in the first decade of the eighteenth century. If the Indians, as Father Kenny asserts, were on the Missouri side, it would account for this lack of information concerning a village, which did not exist. I do not, however, feel that this point has been established without the possibility of contradiction. Possibly, it never will be so established.

I have enjoyed your Symposium very much and am sorry that I cannot satisfy you with a longer exposition of my views, but your

symposium has already had the success that it deserves and a prolongation of the discussion would not be of value.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. ALVORD."

In order that readers may have a view of what another student of history has assembled touching some of the points raised, we are here reproducing a paper prepared by Edward Joseph Fortier.

In a future number we hope, with perhaps some further discussion on some of the points raised, to endeavor to state what questions have been determined by this discussion. In the meantime we present Mr. Fortier's paper.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TAMAROIS MISSION*

The time of the founding of Tamarois or Cahokia has been a disputed question, the date given varying from the time of LaSalle in 1683 to 1699.¹ Never has the exact date of the establishment of the mission been determined. The letters which follow prove that the event fell within the year 1699, sometime between March 28 and May 20.

It may be well, without going into too many details, to review the history of the Illinois missions before taking up the letters which help more particularly to determine the date of the Tamarois Mission. It is not necessary to give the history of the struggle between the Jesuits and the Seminary of Quebec as that has been done elsewhere,² but to speak of the struggle only in so far as it will help to clear up the matter in hand.

The care of the Illinois mission was first confided to Marquette and at his death it was committed to Father Allouez also a Jesuit. When he died exhausted by the great hardships he had undergone, Father Jacques Gravier, of the same society, was appointed Vicar General about 1690.

Evidently Gravier planned a mission among the Tamarois, for

* The very interesting symposium in the April, 1922, number of this REVIEW has made the publication of this article from the *Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Society* appropriate. It will be found in Publication No. 13, Illinois State Historical Library, p. 233 *et seq.*

¹ Peck, J. M., *Gazetteer of Illinois*, etc., 2d edition, Philadelphia, 1837, p. 85; Peck, L. C., *Gazetteer of Illinois*, etc., Albany, 1823, pp. 52, 94; Baird, Robert, *View of the Valley of the Mississippi*, etc., Philadelphia, 1834, p. 47; Winsor, *Mississippi Basin*, p. 5.

² Shea, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, New York, 1886, pp. 536-544.

he writes:³ "About the middle of May the deputies of the savages of this village (Illinois) accompanied by two Frenchmen went to seek the alliance of the Missouri and of the Osages. These French merchants, with the view of carrying on an advantageous trade with those tribes, made some proposals of peace to them; to these they agreed solely out of complaisance to the French, through consideration for whom they became reconciled with the Osages. I would willingly have performed that journey to see for myself whether anything could be done there for the glory of God among Tamaroa and the Kaoukia who are Illinois; and to sound the Missouri and Osages in order to ascertain what could be obtained from them in respect to Christianity; for I have no doubt that I would have found many dying children and adults to baptize. I contented myself with telling them that I would cheerfully have undertaken the journey with them, as its difficulties and fatigues would have been agreeable to me while working for the interests of God." Further in the journal he says:⁴ "But, as I am alone, I cannot assist or visit the other village of the Illinois, which are on the banks of the Mississippi."

The Seminary of Quebec an outgrowth of the "Missions Etrangeres," at Paris felt that it also, would like to do something for the faith and establish missions in New France.⁵ M. de St. Valier, Bishop of Quebec, approved their plans for founding a mission in the Tamarois country and May 1, 1698, gave his authorization to the Seminary. The Seminary was to send a superior who would be Vicar General over the field inhabited by nations on both banks of the Mississippi and its tributaries. They wished to plant their first mission at the Tamarois; but, when the Society of Jesus heard of this, an objection was raised as the Society considered this tribe, since it belonged to the Illinois, already in their care. The Seminary of Quebec, however, looked upon the Tamarois territory, "as the key and necessary passage to reach the more distant nations." By letters patent of July 17, 1698, the very Reverend Francis Jolliet de Montigny, Reverend Anthony Davion and Reverend John Francis Buisson de Saint Cosme were empowered to go to the Mississippi and establish a residence among the Tamarois. The V. Reverend Montigny

³ Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, LXIV. Letter by Father Jacques Gravier in the form of a Journal of the Mission of l'Immaculate Conception de Notre Dame in the Illinois Country, February 15, 1694, p. 161.

⁴ Thwaites, Vol. LXIV, p. 171.

⁵ Shea, *Catholic Church* etc., p. 538; Abbe Gosselin, in *Congres des Americainistes*, Vol. I, p. 31.

was to be Vicar-General and helped defray the expenses of the journey.

The party set out and reached Michillimackinac from which they set out on September 14,⁶ accompanied by Tonty who was to be their guide for the greater part of the journey. On the 4th of October they came to a small Peoria village where Father Marest had planted a cross.⁷ They then stopped in Chicago at the mission of Father Pinet.⁸ "I cannot explain to you, Monseigneur, with what cordiality and marks of esteem these Jesuit Fathers received and caressed us during the time that we had the consolation of staying with them. Their house is built on the banks of a small lake on one side and a fine prairie on the other. If we may judge of the future by the little while that Father Pinet has been on this mission, we may say that God blesses the labors and zeal of this holy missionary."

On November 19, they arrived at Fort Peoria where they found the Reverend Father Marest.⁹ "All the reverend fathers gave us all possible welcome," and Father Marest says:¹⁰ "Three gentlemen of the Quebec Seminary sent by Monseigneur the Bishop to establish missions on the Mississippi, passed through here. We received them as well as we were able, lodging them in our own house, and sharing with them what we could possess amid a scarcity as great as that which prevailed in the village throughout the year. On leaving, we also induced them to take seven sacks of corn that we had left, concealing our poverty from them, so that they might have less objection to receiving what we offered them. In another of our missions, we also fed two of their people.

"As the gentlemen did not know the Illinois language, we gave them a collection of prayers, and a translation of the catechism, with the notes that we have been able to make upon that language in order to help them learn it. In fine, we showed them every possible attention and kindness."

About noon of December 7, 1698, St. Cosme's party arrived at Tamarois.¹¹ "The Tamarois were cabined on an island lower down

⁶ Shea, *Early Voyages Up and Down the Mississippi*, New York, 1861. Letter of J. F. St. Cosme to the Bishop (of Quebec), p. 46.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

¹⁰ Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, Vol. LXV, p. 83. Letter of F. G. Marest, *Illinois Country*, April 29, 1699.

¹¹ Shea, St. Cosme's Letter, p. 66.

than their village, perhaps to get wood more easily, from which their village, which is on the edge of a prairie is somewhat distant, perhaps too for fear of their enemies. We could not well see whether they were numerous. They seemed to us quite so, although the greater part of their people were hunting. There was wherewith to form a fine mission by bringing the Kahokias, who are quite near, and the Michiagamias who are a little lower down on the Mississippi, and said to be quite numerous." The party left Tamarois on the 8th of December and finally arrived at the Arkansas where Mr. de Montigny remained for some time.

I have dwelt at some length upon the St. Cosme's voyage so as to give an idea of the causes at work for the founding of the Tamarois mission. I have also shown the good feelings with which the Jesuits received the Seminary priests. There was soon to be such friction between the two orders that the V. Reverend M. de Montigny was compelled to give up his Vicar-Generalship and to go to France with d'Iberville. Let us now turn to the letters.

Letter No. 1:¹² This extract dated at the Tamarois, March 1700, is written by St. Cosme in answer to a letter written him by Mgr. Laval. The letter was sent by the Reverend Mr. Bergier and young M. de St. Cosme who had not yet taken the priestly vows. In order to give the Mississippi mission more effective force, the Seminary at Quebec had sent out the Reverend M. Bergier and the Reverend M. B. Boutteville in 1699. Young M. de St. Cosme accompanied Mr. Bergier.

M. de Montigny in a letter from the Arkansas in 1699, says:¹³ "As for Mr. de St. Cosme he remains at the Tamarois."¹⁴ Thaumur de LaSource writing also from Arkansas says:^{14a} "Mr. de St. Cosme is at the Tamarois, which is eight leagues from the Illinois. It is the largest village we have seen. There are about three hundred cabins there."¹⁵

It is seen then that in reading the letter that both Montigny and

¹² These letters from the archives of Laval University, Quebec, were called to my attention by Prof. Alvord. I thank M. l'Abbe Amedee Gosselin of Laval University for furnishing us with a copy of them.

¹³ Shea, *Voyage Up and Down*, Montigny's letter, p. 76.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, LaSource's Letter, p. 79.

¹⁵ Abbe Gosselin, *Americaniste*, Vol. I, p. 34. Note says that according to the Quebec census there must have been 1,500 people, or five people to a hut, and he says further: "This LaSource is not the missionary Thaumur LaSource as commonly supposed, but one of the twelve men who accompanied the missionaries who left in 1698. LaSource, the priest, went to the Mississippi in 1718."

St. Cosme are at Tamarois and as the former speaks of what he did during the absence of Montigny who left for Chicago on March 28, 1699, and returned May 20 of the same year, it may be said that the real founding took place between March 28 and May 20, 1699.

The letter ends: "I was very much surprised at Father Bineteau's arrival. He had left Peoria to come and settle in this mission. Father Bineteau and Father Marest were stationed on the Illinois River. Bineteau in his letter of January 1699, says:¹⁶ "I am at present spending the winter with a portion of our savages who are scattered about. I have recently been with the Tamarois, to visit a band of them on the banks of one of the largest rivers in the world, which for this reason we call the Mississippi or 'the great river.' I am to return to the Illinois of Tamarois in the Spring."

"Extracts from a letter of Mr. de St. Cosme to Mgr. Laval dated at Tamarois, March, 1700."

"I have received that (letter) which your highness has done me the honor of sending by Mr. Bergier and my brother who have arrived here the seventh of February. It would be useless for me to describe the difficulties which they have encountered during their journey. Mr. Bergier will tell you about it at some length. I will inform you simply of that which took place in this mission since our arrival from the Arkansas, and since Mr. de Montigny left it to go to Chicago, March 28 of the preceding year 1699. He left me here with two men. I worked toward having my house built and had wood gathered for my chapel. I baptized several children and upon Mr. de Montigny's return from Chicago I had baptized thirty. Upon his arrival, May 20, 1699, he found my house built and lumber for my chapel all ready. We had it (chapel) completed and erected a fine cross. But I was very much surprised at Father Bineteau's arrival. He had left Peoria to come and settle this mission."

Letter No. 2.¹⁷ Shortly after the arrival of Bergier and young St Cosme, the older St. Cosme descended to Natchez.¹⁸ M. de Montigny left for France not long after as we have said and Bergier became Vicar-General. The Reverend M. Bergier remained at the Tamarois post with LaSource who in his letter says:¹⁹ "M. de Montigny inclines to put me at the Tamarois with M. de St. Cosme. I should be not displeased."

¹⁶ Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, Vol. LXV, p. 71. Letter of Father Julian Bineteau, of the Society of Jesus, to a father of the same society.

¹⁷ Part of this letter has been quoted by Abbe Gosselin in *Congres des Americainistes*, 1906, Vol. I, p. 34.

¹⁸ Bernard de la Harpe, *Journal Historique*, in Margy, Vol. V, p. 404.

¹⁹ Shea, *Voyages Up and Down*, LaSource's Letter, p. 85.

M. Bergier wrote the Bishop of Quebec during the latter part of February, 1700:

"I related to your highness our trip to the Illinois, from which place I wrote you all I had found out about the condition of the missions and that which concerns the government of your church. There remains but to inform you of the condition of the latter.

"I arrived there the 7th of this month with young Mr. de St. Cosme, I have counted there a hundred cabins in all, or thereabouts, of which nearly half are vacant because the greater part of the Cahokias are still in winter quarters twenty or twenty-five leagues from here up the Mississippi.

"The village is composed of Tamarois, Cahokias, some Michigans and Peorias. There are also some Missouri cabins, and shortly, there are to come about thirty-five cabins of this last named nation who are winter-quarterming some ten or fifteen leagues from here below the village, on the river. We must not, however, count this nation as forming part of the village and of the Tamarois mission, because it remains there only a few months to make its Indian wheat, while awaiting a day to return to its village, which is more than a hundred leagues away, upon the shores of the Missouri River. This it has not dared to undertake for the last few years for fear of being surprised and defeated on the way by some other hostile nation.

"The Tamarois and the Cahokias are the only ones that really form part of this mission. The Tamarois have about thirty cabins and the Cahokias have nearly twice that number. Although the Tamarois are at present less numerous than the Cahokias, the village is still called Tamaroa, gallicized 'Des Tamarois,' because the Tamarois have been the first and are still the oldest inhabitants and have first lit a fire there, to use the Indian expression. All the other nations who have joined them afterwards have not caused the name of the village to change, but have been under the name Tamarois although they were not Tamarois."

Letter No. 3. Bergier's second letter is a description of the condition at the Tamarois post. Father Pinet²⁰ mentioned here is the one who received St. Cosme at the Chicago mission. He founded the Guardian Angel at Chicago. He had to give it up through Frontenac's hostility and resumed it through Laval's influence. He probably went to Tamarois in 1700 where he labored with Father Bergier. Gravier says:²¹ "Father Pinet discharges peaceably all the functions of missionary and M. Bergier, who gets along very well with us, has care only of the French, and this is a great relief for Father Pinet."

²⁰ Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, Vol. LXIV, p. 278.

²¹ Shea, *Voyages Up and Down*, Gravier Journal, p. 118.

In a letter without address dated at Tamarois, June 14, 1700, Mr. Bergier says:

"We have frequent alarms here and we have several times been obliged to receive within our walls nearly all the women and children of the village. Pentecost Sunday there was one (alarm) which was not without consequences. Fort Sious on the edge of the woods of the Tamarois, in plain sight of the village, cut off the neck of a slave belonging to a Frenchman; stabbed two women to death and scalped them; wounded a girl with a knife and crushed another under foot. They were all picking strawberries. We were about to finish singing compline when the chief ran to our door to warn us that the Sioux were killing them. He threw himself into Mr. de Cosme's canoe, with some Indians and Frenchmen to reconnoitre, partly by water and then by land. Great excitement prevailed. Finally the Sioux were discovered and three were captured, killed, burned and eaten. This is a horrible detail. It partakes less of man than of the wolf, the tiger and the demon. The last of these three Sioux, who was burned only the next day was baptized by F. Pinet, who made use of the 'Lorrain' as an interpreter. He (Sioux) was the nephew of Quakantape, chief of the Sioux, and because of this everyone is very much afraid that the Sioux will want to avenge this death and destroy the village some day. On the other hand the Shawnee, who are enemies of the Illinois, are feared.

"One may say that we are 'inter lupos, in medio nationes pravae et perversae.' Their greatest and most universal passion is to destroy, scalp and eat men, that, is all their ambition, their glory; an essential drawback to Christianity, as long as it will last. But the mercy of Jesus Christ is all powerful. Beseech him that he diffuse it very abundantly over this mission, and over the missionaries, and that he make them 'Prudentes ut serpentes, simplices ut comubat.—Amen.' "

Letter No. 4. M. Bergier's letter of April 13, 1701, gives the story of the separation of the tribes. The news of the settling of the French at the mouth of the river doubtless had great influence upon them as they thought they might get refuge from their enemies. Father Pinet became the Missionary of some of the Tamarois and was followed by the Reverend Bineteau.²² Bergier and LaSource remained at the Tamarois who, as Bergier says: "Will leave soon and there will remain only Cahokia."²³

Letter of Mr. Bergier, without address, but dated April 13, 1701. Extract.

"If I did not wish to assure you of the continuance of my respect it would not be necessary to write to tell you what is happening here,

²² Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, Vol. LXV, p. 263.

²³ *Jesuit Relations*, Vol. LXV. Gravier's Journal, p. 101.

because the French will not fail to tell you all I have to say on the subject.

“1. The Kats to the extent of about thirty cabins have established their new village two leagues below this one on the other side of the Mississippi. They have built a fort there and nearly all the French hastened there.

“2. The chief of the Tamarois followed by some cabins joined the Kats, attracted by Rouensae, who promises them much and makes them believe him, saying that he is called by the great chief of the French, Mr. d'Iberville, as Father Marest has told him.

“3. The remainder of the Tamarois, numbering about twenty cabins, are shortly going to join their chief, already settled at the Kats. So there will remain here only the Cahokias, numbering 60 or 70 cabins. They are now cutting stakes to build a fort.”²⁴

Letter No. 5. The following passage having no date, address or author's name, is an interesting description of the Tamarois or Cahokia country. It has been impossible for me to date it, but I would place it shortly after 1720, after the completion of Fort Chartres.

THE TAMAROIS OR CAHOKIAS²⁵

“The Tamarois or Cahokias are situated about fifteen leagues above the establishment of the French fort of the Illinois, called Fort Chartres, and five leagues below the mouth of the Missouri. The Mississippi flows nearly to the north and south in a plain which is enclosed between mountains on both sides, which slope differently from the river, because to the west, upon ascending the course of this river, it runs along more closely.

“One usually counts twelve leagues, by land, from the establishment of Fort Chartres to the Cahokias, by going by way of the heights, so as to shorten the journey, which is too difficult to allow vehicles conveying provisions to pass. This one may hope to develop in time by work, so that it would seem more necessary to establish communications from one place to the other by the valley than by traveling over the heights. One could build bridges there to facilitate the passage of some drained rivers which come together at that point. These rivers are filled with water, when the Mississippi overflows. One could also establish different habitations in this space where there are a number of prairies which become larger or smaller, as the river is nearer the eastern side.

²⁴ For further references see: Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, LXIV, 161, 264; LXV, 262, 264; LXVI, 339, 348; LXX, 310; Margry, Vol. IV, p. 431; Margry, Vol. V, pp. 444, 490, 634; *Magazine of American History*, Vol. VI, p. 160; Shea, *Voyages Up and Down*, LeSueur, p. 87; *Wisconsin Historical Collections*, Vol. XVI, pp. 179, 180, 181, 331, 332.

²⁵ Copy without author's name or date.

"The woods which we usually see upon the bank of the river from the establishment of the French up to the Cahokias are possibly, in their greatest width, three-quarters of a league wide, and about a quarter of a league in width in the narrowest places. They are good for building and heating (sic) and must be better husbanded for the establishment than those of the coasts which are slender, crooked and of medium height, the greater part being red, tortuous oaks.

"The edge of these coasts is filled with rocks from which one can extract freestones, grindstones, and millstones. Numerous springs rush from this place, at the base of which it would be easy to build watermills. These springs form marshes which are found for nearly the whole length at the base of the mountains where the land seems to be lower than elsewhere.

"From the source of these marshes to the edges of the woods which are found along the river banks, one from time to time sees prairies, which are more or less long or wide, depending upon the river, as has already been noted.

"The real prairie of the Cahokias (where the gentlemen of the missions are established, as well as the Illinois, who have named the village of the Cahokias) is about two leagues long from the southwest to the northwest, by three-quarters of a league wide in the most prominent place, so that it nearly forms a long square. It is bounded to the northeast by a small fringe of woods about half a league wide. This projects from an arm of the Mississippi nearly up to the heights, beyond which there is another prairie at least as extensive as the preceding, but I have never seen it.

"The soil of the Cahokia is very easy to cultivate, being at least two feet deep where it is found to be black, fertile and light. Then there is found a reddish soil which forms a fine sand mixed with light earth. This soil may without great cultivation produce French wheat, tobacco, corn and in season a variety of vegetables in abundance. It may be used as pasture for a number of cattle, which are not hard to care for in winter because only those which are actually working are enclosed in stables or stalls. The others are left to pasture in the open in summer as well as in winter. An island about a league in length by a half league in width has already been determined upon for a 'commune.' This island forms the arm of the Mississippi upon which are established the gentlemen of the missions and the savages. This, to prevent the cattle from harming the dwellings which may be put up later.

"The prairie of which we have just spoken abundantly furnish lands for 150 good workmen.

"Between this prairie and another to the south there is still another fringe of woods about half a league in extent. A little river which sometimes dries up divides it. This prairie may be also from two leagues or thereabouts in length, by three-quarters of a league in width situated between the mountains and the fringe of woods, by the banks of the river. It is like the preceding and is about the same shape. It may also hold 50 good inhabitants and serve as pasture for

all the cattle they may need. The inhabitants, however, will have a little further to haul their possessions upon the river bank.

“The soil found upon the heights varies. Some of it is in extended prairies and others are covered with woods, the greater part of which are red oaks. Good settlements may be developed there in the future, either to gather wheat or to plant vines, granting that some may be had from Europe which are already rooted cuttings. It seems, however, more proper to settle on the banks of the river because of the convenience of transportation. There are already at Kaskaskias, at the settlement of Fort Chartres and at the Cahokias more than 1500 horned animals and 150 horses, without counting those belonging to the Indians.

“The distance from Kaskaskia to Cahokia is reckoned as being 21 leagues by land, so that one will be able to establish settlements in this space sufficient to sustain many inhabitants and to shelter oneself from the outrages of the Indians.

“The flour and other provisions (sic) can be carried down the river to give the inhabitants who are there more commodities for their livelihood, and will give returns to those of the Illinois for their sustenance as well as the necessary provisions.”

EDWARD JOSEPH FORTIER

In Transactions, Illinois State Historical Society, 1908.

ILLINOIS' FIRST CITIZEN, PIERRE GIBAUT

A number of papers have appeared in the ILLINOIS CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW from time to time since its establishment concerning the Very Rev. Pierre Gibault. As has been before stated, the writer is desirous of making known everything that can be learned about Father Gibault, Illinois' first and, in many respects, greatest citizen. In pursuit of that purpose we have published not only everything that we could obtain from original research, but as well the papers and researches of others. Additional articles have been held in abeyance while we have been earnestly seeking information respecting the last years of Father Gibault's life and his death and burial. Unfortunately we have succeeded but very poorly in this quest.

It has long been the intention to reproduce the very excellent paper read before the Illinois State Historical Society by the Indiana historian, J. P. Dunn, and published in Publication No. 10 of the Historical Library of Illinois in 1905. This excellent paper insofar as it relates to Father Gibault is herewith reproduced.

As an introduction Mr. Dunn deals at considerable length with the prior history of the Illinois country, and tells interestingly of the banishment of the Jesuits and the efforts of the lone priest in the field, Father Meurin, to secure clerical assistance. At this point we take up Mr. Dunn's able paper.

To the aid of this lone Jesuit (Father Sebastien Lewis Meurin), who was upholding the cross in the Upper Mississippi Valley, Father Pierre Gibault was sent in the spring of 1768. He was of an old Canadian family, his great grandfather, "Gabriel Gibaut, *dît* Poitevin," a native of Poitiers, France, having married at Quebec, October 30, 1667. His father and his grandfather, both of whom bore the same name of Pierre Gibaut (The Abbe Tanguary, uses this spelling of the family name, and treats Gibault, Gibeau, etc., as variations), were natives of Canada. His mother's maiden name was Marie-Joseph St. Jean. His parents were married November 14, 1735, at Sorel, and he, the eldest son, was christened on April 7, 1737, at Montreal. After his primary schooling, and some travel in the western wilds, he was educated in theology at the Seminary of Quebec, and, by an odd coincidence, the expense of his education was paid out of a remnant of the Cahokia Mission property, which had been invested as a "rente" or mortgage annuity of 333 livres a year, on the Hotel

de Ville. He was ordained at Quebec on the feast of St. Joseph, March 19, 1768. He celebrated his first Mass on the following day, in the Ursuline Church, and served for a short time in the Cathedral at Quebec, after which he set out for the Illinois country. His journey was delayed by adverse weather, but he reached Michilimackinac in July, and put in a week there, confessing the voyagers and converted Indians, baptizing the children, and blessing one marriage.

It was intended that he should locate at Cahokia, but on reaching the place a change of plans was made. Kaskaskia was the principal settlement, and the people there wanted the young priest, while the people of Cahokia wanted the veteran, so Father Meurin located there, taking charge also of Prairie du Rocher, and Father Gibault took up his residence at Kaskaskia, his first recorded service there being a baptism on September 8, 1768.

Soon after arriving at Kaskaskia, Father Gibault was attacked by the ague, which was always prevalent there, and had a long and enervating struggle with it; but he kept on incessantly with his pastoral work. By his efforts he not only succeeded in getting the people to attend to their church duties, but also to pay their tithes, which, according to the Canadian usage, were one-twenty-sixth of the produce, instead of one-tenth, but yet gave good support to the clergy in the times of the virgin fertility of the soil. He also attended to the spiritual wants of the Missouri settlements, from which Father Meurin was debarred, and in 1769, blessed the little chapel which the settlers had erected at St. Louis. In the same year, evidently at the desire of Father Meurin, Bishop Briand made him Vicar-General for this region. It was not until the winter of 1769-70 that he reached Vincennes, and then through peril; for hostile Indians beset the settlements and twenty-one of the people had fallen victims to them since he reached the country. Shea says that "the frontier priests always, in these days of peril, carried a gun and two pistols," so that Maurice Thompson's description of the armament of "Father Beret," in "Alice of old Vincennes", has historical basis. Father Gibault reached the little post in safety, and in a letter to Bishop Briand, after deploring the vices and disorder that prevailed there, he says:

"However, on my arrival, all crowded down to the banks of the River Wabash to receive me, some fell on their knees, unable to speak; others could speak only in sobs; some cried out: 'Father, save us, we are almost in hell;,' others said: 'God has not then yet abandoned us, for He has sent you to us to do penance for our sins. * * * Oh sir,

why did you not come sooner, my poor wife, my dear father, my dear mother, my poor child, would not have died without the sacraments.”¹

For two months, Father Gibault remained at Vincennes, and not only revived the faith of the Catholics, but also brought into the fold a Presbyterian family which had settled there. The parishioners gave earnest of their zeal by erecting a new church—a wooden structure that was occupied for some fifteen years (the somewhat more substantial church which followed this one was also erected through the efforts of Father Gibault²), and when he set out for Kaskaskia a guard of twenty men accompanied him across the Illinois prairies.

On his return he found the Spanish in possession of the region west of the Mississippi, but with no priests. He ministered to them until 1772, when Father Dagobert, Superior of the Capuchins at New Orleans, sent Father Valentine as parish priest to St. Louis and in the next year, Father Hilary to Ste. Genevieve. This left Father Gibault free to devote his time to the country east of the river, but that occupied him fully, for Father Meurin was old and feeble and in 1774, a crushing message came to him from New Orleans in the news that Pope Clement XIV had suppressed the Society of Jesus. In the whole Valley of the Mississippi Father Meurin, who had labored so faithfully there, was the only priest affected by the Brief of Suppression; and he, who had kept on with his work for more than a decade without local or provincial superior, now threw himself on the mercy of Bishop Briand, and wrote to him: “Free, I would beseech and beg your charitable goodness to be a father to me, and admit absolutely among the number of your clergy, instead of an auxiliary as I have been since February 1, 1742. I should deem myself happy, if, in the little of life left me, I could repair the cowardice and negligence of which I have been guilty in the space of thirty-three years. If you will adopt me, I am sure you will pardon me and ask mercy for me.”³

In 1775 Father Gibault visited Canada, and on his return reached Michilimackinac in September. After waiting a month without finding opportunity to reach the Illinois, he returned for the winter to Detroit, making the journey in a canoe, with great peril and suffering. He wrote from Detroit, on December 4, to Bishop Briand: “The suffering I have undergone between Michilimackinac and this place has so deadened my faculties that I only half feel my chagrin at being unable to proceed to the Illinois. I shall do my best not to be useless

¹Shea, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*, p. 128.

²*Ibid.*, p. 470.

³*Ibid.*, p. 129.

at Detroit, and to relieve the two venerable old priests who attend it.”⁴ He had visited Vincennes in March, 1775, and did not reach that point again until the summer of 1777, Phillibert officiating in lay capacity in the meantime.

The Revolutionary War was now under way, and the harassing of the frontiers by Indian allies of the British led to the memorable expedition of George Rogers Clark. Imagination could hardly picture anything more desperate than this undertaking. With a force of less than 200 men⁵ and a military chest supplied only with 8,000 pounds sterling of almost worthless Virginia scrip, he marched into the Northwest. It was evident that he could succeed only through the friendship and co-operation of the French settlers, and Clark realized it. And of all of these, now that their old military leaders were gone, no man's influence was so important as that of Father Gibault, who for ten years had ministered to the spiritual wants of the people, had advised them in their business and other affairs, had baptized their children, had given consolation to their sick, had buried their dead. The astute American leader understood this, and was well pleased when, after the capture of Kaskaskia, the priest came with a half-a-dozen elderly citizens to ask the privilege of assembling the people in the church that they might prepare for their separation. He extended a little hope, and was not surprised when, after spending some time at the church, the delegation returned, with Father Gibault at its head. Says Clark, in his memoir: “They remained a considerable time in the church, after which the priest and many of the principal men came to me to return thanks for the indulgence shown them, and begged permission to address me further on the subject that was more dear to them than anything else; that their present situation was the fate of war; that the loss of their property they could reconcile; but were in hopes that I would not part them from their families; and that the women and children might be allowed to keep some of their clothes and a small quantity of provisions.” This was the point of depression at which Clark was prepared to act. He says: “I asked them very abruptly whether or not they thought they were speaking to savages; that I was certain they did from the tenor of their conversation. Did they suppose that we meant to strip the women and children, or take the bread out of their mouths or that we would condescend to make war on the women or children or the church? It was to prevent the effusion of innocent blood by the Indians, through the instigation of

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 130.

⁵ English, *Conquest of the Northwest*, Vol. 1, p. 154.

their commander's emissaries, that caused us to visit them, and not the prospect of plunder; that as soon as that object was attained we should be perfectly satisfied; that as the King of France joined the Americans, there was a probability of there shortly being an end of the war (this information very apparently affected them). They were at liberty to take which side they pleased, without any dread of losing their property or having their families destroyed. As for their church, all religions would be tolerated in America, and so far from our intermeddling with it, that any insult offered to it should be punished; and to convince them that we were not savages and plunderers, as they had conceived, that they might return to their families and inform them that they might conduct themselves as usual, with all freedom and without apprehensions of any danger."

This declaration relieved all fear, and the town was soon in a noisy demonstration of joy and gratitude. And the effect was lasting, for the French volunteered to go to Cahokia, and induce their friends there to join the American cause, and in a few days the Illinois settlements were peopled with men who had taken the oath of allegiance to the American colonies.

In his broad promise of religious toleration Clark was perhaps wiser than even he realized, for the Church had suffered under British rule. Of course, the French authorities of Louisiana were responsible for the expulsion of the Jesuits, but it had occurred after the country had been subject to Great Britain. Moreover, church property, and especially that of the Seminary of Cahokia, which had been unlawfully disposed of, had not been restored. The English commandants were repeatedly asked to restore the Cahokia mission property, but refused to do so, and Gibault was never able to carry out his instructions from the Bishop of Quebec, in regard to it. Moreover, Clark states in his letter to Mason that Gibault, in his recent visit to Canada had become somewhat acquainted with the issues between Great Britain and the colonies, and "was rather prejudiced in favor of us." He further states when the declaration of religious freedom was made to Gibault, it "seemed to complete his happiness." Certainly Gibault was heart and soul with the Americans from that time forward. He promoted the movement for bringing all the French of the Illinois settlements into allegiance; he volunteered to go to Post Vincennes and win over the people there; in company with Dr. Lefont he made this journey, administered the oath of allegiance to the French settlers, secured possession of the fort, and urged the Indians to take sides with the Americans as the French were doing. After Hamilton had recaptured Vincennes, when Clark started on his desperate winter march

to retake it, Gibault made a patriotic address to the troops, and gave his blessing to them and their enterprise. Perhaps even more important were his services in a financial way for he publicly sold his own property to the Americans, accepting for it Virginia scrip at face value, and by his example he induced the French settlers and merchants to do the same. Judge Law did not at all overestimate Gibault's services when he said: "To him, next to Clark and Vigo, the United States are more indebted for the accession of the States comprised in what was the original northwestern territory than to any other man."⁶

There is perhaps a better measure of Father Gibault's sacrifices for the American cause in the testimony of his enemies than in that of his friends, for the British recognized the damage he had done to them even more keenly than the Americans recognized the service to their cause. Immediately after hearing of Clark's capture of Kaskaskia, Hamilton sent a dispatch with the information, in which he said: "The rebels have sent a detachment with an officer to Cahokia to receive the submission of the inhabitants, and the person who brought the account has no doubt but those of St. Vincennes are by this time summoned, as a French priest named Gibault had his horse ready saddled to proceed there, from Cahokia, with power to act as agent for the rebels. This Ecclesiastic is a fellow of infamous morals, and I believe very capable of acting such a part."⁷ In the year after General Hamilton had retaken Vincennes, a half-dozen of the French militia, having deserted him, he wrote: "One of the deserters was a brother to Gibault, the priest, who had been an active agent for the rebels and whose vicious and immoral conduct was sufficient to do infinite mischief in a country where ignorance and bigotry give full scope to the depravity of a licentious ecclesiastic. This wretch it was who absolved the French inhabitants from their allegiance to the King of Great Britain. To enumerate the vices of the inhabitants would be to give a long catalogue, but to assert that they are not in possession of a single virtue is no more than truth and justice require; still the most eminently vicious and scandalous was the Reverend Monsieur Gibault."⁸

These bursts of wrath from the "hair-buying general" would be almost amusing were it not that the slander here uttered was persistently repeated and worked most serious injury to the victim. In 1779 Lieut. Governor St. Clair reported: "General Carlton and the Bishop

⁶ Law, *History of Vincennes*, p. 55.

⁷ Griffin, *American Catholic Historical Researches*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (Oct. 1891), p. 186.

⁸ English, *Conquest of the Northwest*, Vol. 1, p. 242.

sent up one Gibou, a priest, on a mission for reasons best known to themselves, the part which he at present takes in the rebel interest and may hereafter improve upon, requires in my humble opinion *a mandate from Mon. Seigneur for his appearance at Quebec*. His conduct will certainly justify me to the General in making this representation, and I do it to avoid any future severity which may, by means of Indians, be necessary to direct against an individual of the sacred and respectable clergy. He removes to the Spanish and this side of the Mississippi occasionally, and may be addressed at the Cascaskies.’⁹ In 1780, perhaps in pursuance of this suggestion, the Bishop of Quebec ordered him to present himself and answer certain accusations that had been made against him.¹⁰ The exact character of the accusation is not known, and it appears that the order was not pressed, for Gibault did not go to Quebec, though he made defense by letter in 1786 to the charges accumulated to date. In his letter of June 6, of that year, he gave the old and simple answer, “The works that I do in my Father’s name, they bear witness of me”—putting it in these words:

To all the pains and hardships I have undergone in my different journeys to most distant points, winter and summer, attending so many villages in Illinois distant from each other, in all weathers, night and day, snow or rain, storm or fog on the Mississippi, so that I never slept four nights in a year in my own bed, never hesitating to start at a moment’s notice, whether sick or well, how can a priest who sacrifices himself in this way, with no other view than God’s glory, and the salvation of his neighbor, with no pecuniary reward, almost always ill-fed, unable to attend to both spiritual and temporal needs; how, I say, can you know such a priest zealous to fulfill the duties of his holy ministry, careful to watch over his flock, instruct them in the most important tenets of religion, instruct the young unceasingly and untiringly not only in Christian doctrine, but teaching the boys to read and write, as one who gives scandal, and is addicted to intoxication?’¹¹

All the evidence existing confirms this statement, and indicates that these charges were utterly unfounded. His own letters bear testimony. In this same year he writes to Bishop Briand from Vincennes: “I should be well enough pleased with the people, were it not for the wretched liquor trade which I cannot eradicate, and which

⁹ Letter of Lt. Gov. St. Clair to Capt. Brehm, dated Oct. 15, 1779. *Haldimand Papers* quoted in *American Catholic Historical Researches*, Vol. 5, No. 1, (Jan. 1, 1888), p. 52.

¹⁰ Records of the American Catholic Historical Society, Vol. 12, p. 488, Miss Peyton’s Prize Essay.

¹¹ Shea, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*, p. 470.

compels me to refuse the sacraments to several, for the Indians commit horrible disorders when in liquor."¹² These were indeed strange sentiments for a man "addicted to intoxication"—a man who carried his temperance reform work to the extent of refusing the sacraments of the Church to a liquor dealer who refused to submit to regulation.

But Father Gibault's good character has other witnesses. Father Meurin, himself a post-graduate in the hardships of missionary life, had always the warmest commendation for his assistant. He wrote: "M. Gibault is full of zeal, and for this reason he cannot last long, unless it pleases our God to renew ancient miracles; he has often to go on perilous journeys, across woods and mountains, exposed to weather, rivers and torrents. M. Gibault, since his arrival in this country, has always been sick of fevers—first great and dangerous, then slight and slow—against which his courage has always sustained him so that he could perform his duties in the parish of the Immaculate Conception at Kaskaskia."¹³ That his superiors held him in esteem is conclusively shown by his retention as Vicar-General by the Bishop of Quebec so long as this region was in his jurisdiction. It is unquestionable that his people had high regard for him, and it is notable that in one of the few printed documents of the Illinois country of this period—a pamphlet printed about 1772, urging better government, the establishment of schools, etc.,—is found the testimonial, "We have had a long experience of the exemplary piety and virtue of our worthy Fathers Meurin and Gibault."¹⁴ In the face of this evidence no one can credit such charges with so evident a source of malevolence in plain view. Nevertheless the reiterated slander had some effect, and it was added to by a peculiar complication. After the treaty with Great Britain at the close of the Revolutionary War, the authorities at Rome made the Church in the United States independent of the diocese of London; and in 1784 John Carroll of Baltimore, was made Prefect Apostolic for the United States and, in 1790, Bishop of a diocese including them. He naturally assumed that the Illinois country was in his jurisdiction, and appointed Reverend Huet de la Valiniere his Vicar-General for the region. But Detroit and the country about the lakes was still held by the British, and the Bishop of Quebec still exercised control there. Neither Bishop Briand nor his successor, Bishop Hubert, relieved Father Gibault of his responsibility as Vicar-General, and as he declined to give way without orders

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 470.

¹³ Records of American Catholic Historical Society, Vol. 12, p. 472.

¹⁴ Quoted in Life of Archbishop Carroll, p. 132.

from his superior, a double spiritual rule ensued and continued until 1791, when Father Gibault withdrew from Cahokia where he had been officiating, and retired to the Spanish territory west of the Mississippi. It is quite probable that this withdrawal was partly due to Father Gibault's treatment by the United States authorities.

In the spring of 1790 Congress having ordered donations of lands to those who had served in the militia, Father Gibault asked for a small return for his services. His letter addressed to Governor St. Clair is well known, and there is a simple pathos in its recitation of his sacrifice of 7,800 livres in goods and money to aid Clark, and not a cent of which had been repaid, of the straits to which he had been reduced on this account, of his hope, that justice would be done, and of his continued service to the United States. He says, "The love of his country and of liberty has also led your memorialist to reject all of the advantages offered him by the Spanish Government; and he endeavored by every means in his power, by exertions and exhortations, and by letters to the principal inhabitants, to retain every person in the dominion of the United States in expectation of better times, and giving them to understand that our lives and property having been employed twelve years in the aggrandizement and preservation of the United States, would at last receive acknowledgment, and be compensated by the enlightened and upright ministers, who sooner or later would come to examine into and relieve our situation." He asked for the old Cahokia mission property, about five acres, the title to which had been unsettled for so long that nobody seemed to have any claim to it.¹⁵ But, unfortunately for his hopes, St. Clair had no authority to make such a grant, and reported the request to Washington, saying, "I believe no injury would be done to anyone by his request being granted, but it was not for me to give away the lands of the United States."¹⁶

Shea states that this request was granted, but that Bishop Carroll entered a protest against the proposal to convey church property to an individual, and "apparently in consequence the Rev. Mr. Gibault left the Diocese of Baltimore and retired to the Spanish territory beyond the Mississippi."¹⁷ I find no basis for this statement. It is hardly possible that Bishop Carroll could have interposed while the matter was in Governor St. Clair's hands, and if he had St. Clair would probably have mentioned it. No one else had any authority to

¹⁵ American State Papers, Public Lands, Vol. 1, p.21.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁷ Shea, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*, p. 472.

make the donation except Congress, and there is nothing to indicate any movement in that direction by Congress. It was a case of seeking relief from a wrong source, a mistake natural enough to one accustomed to the plenary power of the French commandants, who made all the land grants in the olden time. There is mention made in a list of allotments to "heads of families" which had never been confirmed, but which "ought to be confirmed," of one to Pierre Gibault, but the owner of the claim at the time was John Rice Jones, to whom the original allottee had evidently been obliged by his necessities, to sell his claim, and if the claim was ever confirmed, it, of course, was to Jones.

It has also been commonly stated by historians that Father Gibault received a "concession" of a small tract of land in Vincennes from Secretary Winthrop Sargent, the impression being given that this was a donation from the Government. This is entirely erroneous, Sargent, as well as St. Clair, acted under the congressional resolution of August 29, 1788, which among other things, provided for "confirming in their possessions and titles, the French and Canadian inhabitants and other settlers at Post St. Vincents who, on or before the year 1783, had settled there, and had professed themselves citizens of the United States, or any of them and for laying off to them, at their own expense, the several tracts which they rightfully claim, and which may have been allotted to them according to the laws and usages of the Government under which they have respectively settled."¹⁸

This was a legal obligation on the United States, expressly imposed by the deed of cession from Virginia, which stipulated that the private property rights of the French settlers should be protected. Sargent included this lot of Gibault's in his list of the "ancient rights" that were to be surveyed "at the expense of the proper claimants;" and the only "concession" he made was the concession that Father Gibault had shown by legal evidence that he was the owner of, and entitled to possession of it.

But even this confirmation of ancient titles, which was intended as an act of justice, was in reality a serious hardship to the French settlers, and Gibault and eighty-seven others united in a protest to the government against it. In this document they maintained that the order was neither necessary nor judicious, saying: "It does not appear necessary, because, from the establishment of the colony to this day, they have enjoyed their property and possessions, without disputes or lawsuits on the subject of their limits; that the surveys

¹⁸ Journals of Congress, Vol. 4, p. 859.

of them were made at the time the concessions were obtained from their ancient kings, lords and commandants; and that each of them knew what belonged to him, without attempting an encroachment on his neighbor, or fearing that his neighbor would encroach on him. It does not appear adapted to pacify them, because, instead of assuring to them the peaceable possession of their ancient inheritance, as they have enjoyed it till now, that clause obliges them to bear expenses which, in their present situation, they are absolutely incapable of paying, and for the failure of which they must be deprived of their lands.

“Your excellency is an eye-witness of the poverty to which the inhabitants are reduced, and of the total want of provisions to subsist on. Not knowing where to find a morsel of bread to nourish their families, by what means can they support the expense of a survey which has not been sought for on their parts and for which it is conceived by them there is no necessity? Loaded with misery, and groaning under the weight of misfortunes, accumulated since the Virginia troops entered their country, the unhappy inhabitants throw themselves under the protection of your excellency, and take the liberty to solicit you to lay their deplorable situation before Congress; and, as it may be interesting for the United States to know exactly the extent and limits of their ancient possessions, in order to ascertain the lands which are yet at the disposal of Congress, it appears to them, in their humble opinion, that the expense of survey ought more properly to be borne by Congress, for whom alone it is useful, than by them who do not feel the necessity of it.”¹⁹

This may seem a dark picture, but it is not overdrawn. Even nature seemed to have turned against these people, and floods, frosts and droughts ruined their crops. There was actual famine. People lost their lives by eating poisonous roots to satisfy their hunger. Governor St. Clair and Major Hamtramck not only testified to the facts, but furnished corn from the government supplies to the starving people.²⁰ In truth, our French friends fared hardly under American rule, and none so badly as Father Gibault, who did not get any return in land as a militiaman or the head of a family, and lost his ecclesiastical support on account of the change of jurisdiction. He never received a particle of compensation from Virginia or the United States for his services, and he never received one cent of repayment for money and goods actually furnished to our troops. The situation

¹⁹ American State Papers, Public Lands, Vol. 1, p. 16.

²⁰ Dunn's *Indiana*, pp. 268-9.

seems almost incredible, but it was a horrible reality. The French claimnants had neither the knowledge nor the pecuniary ability to press their claims, and there was no one to do it for them. In truth, the situation of the French settlers justifies this conclusion of President Roosevelt:

“The conquest of the Illinois territory was fraught with the deepest and most far-reaching benefits to all the American people; it is likewise benefited, in at least an equal degree, the boldest and most energetic among the French inhabitants, those who could hold their own among freemen, who could swim in troubled waters; but it may well be doubted whether to the mass of the ignorant and simple creoles it was not a curse rather than a blessing.”²¹

To Sargent's credit be it said that on July 31, 1790, he wrote to the President:

“I must take the liberty of representing to Congress, by desire of the citizens of this country, and as a matter which I humbly conceive they should be informed of, that there are, not only at this place (Vincennes) but in the several villages upon the Mississippi, considerable claims for supplies furnished troops of Virginia, before and since 1783, which no person yet has been authorized to attend to. and which is very injurious to the interest and feelings of men who seem to have been exposed to a variety of distresses and impositions by characters pretending to have acted under the orders of that government.”

This was sent to Congress, but nothing was done. It is not surprising that after years of weary waiting Father Gibault at length abandoned the country of his choice and went to the Spanish settlements beyond the Mississippi, where he might at least hope to avoid starvation. Of his life after that time the fullest information collected is by the Reverend J. Sasseville, cure of the Parish of Ste. Foye, near Quebec, who says:

“In 1790, M. Gibault still resided at the parish of Cahokia, as the date in his memoir indicates. The registers of this parish still bear his signature the following year, when he disappeared without ever returning. In the archives of the Archbishop of St. Louis, we find that M. Gibault gave a mission among the Arkansas in 1792 and 1793, and that this same year he was nominated pastor of New Madrid in the southern part of the State of Missouri. This is the last trace we have of him. My final researches have been unsuccessful. It is certain that he died at New Madrid in the end of the last century or at the beginning of the present.”²²

²¹ Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, Vol. 2, p. 185.

²² Lambing, *Catholic Historical Researches*, Vol. 2, p. 118.

Shea says that he died at New Madrid in 1804.²³ Unfortunately the old parish records of New Madrid were destroyed by fire during the Civil War, and it may now be impossible to ascertain the date with certainty. The probability is, as stated by Edmond Mallet that he passed his last days "in unmerited poverty and obscurity among his compatriots of the Mississippi Valley, and that his ashes repose in the land which he illumined by his charity and patriotism. The Republic may yet repair its neglect of this great patriot, and the Great West may yet erect a monument to his memory. Be that as it may, his name must ever be cherished by American Catholics as one of the foremost of those glorious heroes of the faith who merited well of their country during the struggle for American Independence."²⁴ By an evidently erroneous citation of this article Mr. Shea does a great injustice to its author by charging him with holding Father Gibault responsible for executions for witchcraft in the Illinois country.²⁵ There is absolutely no reference to the subject in the article. I have never found the charge anywhere except in Roosevelt's *Winning of the West*.²⁶ It is there based on an inferential argument that is very far from being conclusive.

It is cause for congratulation that the Illinois State Historical Society has taken up the task of seeing that a suitable memorial is given to this American patriot, for one may well question whether we of this generation have room to criticize our predecessors, his contemporaries, for their neglect. True, they neglected him in his life, but we have neglected him in the tomb. They were more closely acquainted with his great and unquestionable services, but they who knew this region as the wilderness of more than a century ago had no conception of the magnitude of those services as have we, who know today the empire he contributed so largely to give us. We realize, as they did not, that his service to our country was not only in the aid given to Clark, but also in the long life of arduous labor for the welfare of the people and the reclamation of the fertile land we enjoy and yet we have let the record of those labors lie in our midst unpublished, almost inaccessible, and in danger of destruction by fire—as occurred to the parish records of New Madrid and Pensacola—or from other cause. And we have done this to our own hurt, for we profess to be interested in the history of this region, and yet

²³ Shea, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*, p. 596.

²⁴ "Very Rev. Pierre Gibault, Patriot Priest of the West," in *Washington Catholic*, Sept. 30, 1882.

²⁵ Shea, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*, p. 190.

²⁶ Vol. 2, p. 175.

we have spent years puzzling over questions that would be readily answered if the ancient records of the parishes in which Father Gibault officiated were published. I have mentioned how we have stumbled and groped in the dark in the case of the St. Ange family, and how even now we lack information concerning them that lies within our reach. This is but one of many cases. Indiana historians blundered for years concerning William Clark, one of the first judges of the Territorial Court of Indiana. Some confused him with William Clark, a prominent land surveyor of the territory. Some confused him with William Clark, brother of George Rogers Clark, and subsequently of the celebrated Lewis and Clark expedition. At length Hon. W. H. English thought to have an investigation made of the parish records of Vincennes, and there was found the record of his death and burial, fully explaining the mystery.²⁷

Moreover, while the eastern states are collecting and publishing all the information that can be obtained concerning their revolutionary soldiers, shall we neglect this mine of information concerning the revolutionary soldiers of this region who served under George Rogers Clark, and whose services were recognized and rewarded by their American contemporaries? Do we not owe them something?

It may be thought that the work proposed is large. In reality it is small as compared with the similar work covering all the ancient parish records of Canada, every item of which is made available in the great Genealogical Dictionary of Canada by the Abbe Tanguay. Shall not this generation do its duty to that past generation and to Father Gibault by the publication of a Gibault Memorial Volume which shall include the ancient parish records of this region, and the correspondence from the clergy that lies unpublished in the archives of the Bishop of Quebec? Surely Illinois, Indiana, and Missouri owe this much to the man who was Vicar-General of this region for twenty years, and who did so much to bring it into the United States.

It may be said that this would be more a service to ourselves than a memorial to him. Not so. We can do him no direct service. In such a situation, confronted by unrequired merit, we may well remember the solemn words:

“Can storied urn or animated bust
Back to its mansion call the fleeting breath?
Can honor's voice provoke the silent dust?
Can flattery soothe the dull, cold ear of death?”

²⁷ English, *Conquest of the Northwest*, Vol. 2, p. 1015.

The utmost we can do for Father Gibault is to hold him in grateful memory, and make the record of his service known to the world, that others may do likewise. But if he could speak,—if we could ask him what memorial he would prefer—can we doubt, knowing his life of self-sacrifice and labors for others, that he would answer, “Whatever would most benefit my fellow-men.” And he would answer rightly, for in that service man attains title to the highest tribute that can be paid to the dead: “He rests from his labors, and his works do follow him.”

Chicago.

JOSEPH J. THOMPSON.

COLONEL RICARD O'SULLIVAN BURKE

The life story of this veteran is an inspiration to men who are not afraid of hardships, sufferings and sacrifices, and who are willing to risk life, liberty and property in order that their fellowmen may enjoy the blessings of religious and political liberty.

He was the son of Dennis and Margaret Burke and was born at Keneagh, near Dunmanway, County Cork, Ireland, January 24, 1838, which would leave him over eighty-four years of age at the time of his death on May 11, 1922.

During his boyhood days he attended the National School at Dunmanway, County Cork, under a teacher named Murphy, who was exceedingly pro-British, and who, when Burke was convicted as a Fenian, regretted very much that he ever had such a pupil in his school.

During his boyhood he showed decided military tastes; and in 1853, when the Crimean war broke out he endeavored to join the British army in order to get into a practical school of war, but was rejected on account of his youth. Not to be daunted in his desire to secure military training he joined the Cork militia, which was composed principally of outcasts who could find no other occupation. When the militia was disbanded in 1856 young Burke was ashamed to go home, so he became supercargo of a sailing vessel and "followed the sea" for a few years, during which time he visited the principal Mediterranean ports and also Japan, Peru, Chili, Argentine, Mexico and the United States. He spent one year in Paris, France, where he studied art, attending classes at the Louvre and familiarized himself with the French language, which he utilized later to his great advantage. He returned to the United States in 1861, and at the commencement of the Civil War he enlisted in the Union army where he was assigned to the 15th New York Light infantry, in command of Col. John McLeod Murphy.

CIVIL WAR RECORD

This regiment was soon afterwards moved to Bellevue Gardens and later to Fort Schuyler, and then to what is now the headquarters of the Torpedo Squad at Willetts Point, Long Island, New York. Later the regiment was ordered to Washington and afterwards moved to Maryland.

Just before the first battle of Bull Run, which was fought on July 21, 1861, he was appointed color bearer of the regiment and he

took an active part in this battle. His division was soon afterwards sent to Washington to attend the Engineering Training School, and here he became proficient in the profession which he afterwards followed in civil life, that of civil engineer.

He participated in the battles of Glouster, the Seven Days Battles from Mechanicsville, on June 26, 1862, to Malvern Hill, on July 1, 1862, also in the second battle of Bull Run on August 29-30, 1862, the battle of Chancellorsville on May 2-3, 1863, and the battle of Franklin's Crossing. Soon after these battles he was appointed first lieutenant and served through the battle of the Wilderness, May 5-6, 1864, Spottsylvania, May 8-12, 1864, and many others during that year. It was during this latter battle that Gen. Grant sent his famous message: "I propose to fight it out on this line if it takes all summer." During this year he was assigned to Gen. Grant's headquarters at City Point as engineer in charge of the fortifications of the division. Later followed the siege of Petersburg, and on April 2, 1865, the Confederates were forced to evacuate the town. He was one of twelve men appointed by Gen. Grant to tunnel their way under the city of Richmond, and the work was only commenced when that city surrendered. In May, 1865, he was made Captain and placed in charge of a company at Burke's Station, Virginia, and was promoted to the rank of Colonel before he was mustered out of service at Fort Barry, Va., June 13, 1865.

FENIAN RECORD AND ACTIVITIES

Col. Burke joined the Fenian Brotherhood in New York before his regiment left for the front in 1861, and rendered that organization every assistance possible to organize the Fenian Brotherhood in the United States army. As the British government at the time was aiding the Confederacy, and the Fenians were opposed to British rule in Ireland and British interference in the United States, the American government threw no obstacles in the way of those in the army organizing the Fenian Brotherhood and sympathizing with the objects and purposes of that organization.

In a speech in New York at a Manchester Martyrs' anniversary celebration, November 24, 1910, Colonel Burke stated that: "In 1861-2-3, the Fenian Brotherhood had in the ranks of the United States army many members, non-commissioned officers and officers; in the armies of the West, the army of the Ohio, the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the Trans-Mississippi; in the army of the Valley, the army of the Potomac, the James and the department of the East. I had the honor of being Centre of the Division of the Fenian

Brotherhood in the army of the Potomac, which embraced the artillery and the engineers. The head of the organization in the army of the Potomac was one of the ablest and most gallant of the generals of that most gallant army, Gen. Thomas A. Smyth of Delaware; and in the last fight of the war he had a Major General's command and a Brigadier General's rank. * * * Gen. Smyth was killed in action and I cannot tell you how grave a loss that was to Ireland.

"At Gettysburg we lost many more of our officers. Gettysburg preceded the action at Sailor's creek by nearly two years. At Gettysburg we lost one of the brightest minds of the organization, Col. O'Rourke, Lieutenant of Engineers of the United States army and Colonel commanding one of the volunteer regiments of New York."

He cited among those officers of the United States army who had placed their services at the command of the Fenian Brotherhood after the Civil war for services in Ireland, Gen. William G. Halpin, who commanded a brigade in Gen. Sherman's western army; Gen. Michael Kerwin, the youngest Brigadier under Gen. Sherman, Capt. James Murphy of the 13th Massachusetts Volunteers; Col. Thomas J. Kelly* of the 10th Ohio, Capt. Timothy Deasy* of the 9th Massachusetts, Capt. Michael O'Rourke of one of Meagher's Brigade regiments, Lieut. Col. John W. Byron of Meagher's 88th, Gen. Denis F. Burke, Colonel of the 88th New York, and many other officers who rendered efficient service in the Union army during the Civil War.

SERVICES IN IRELAND AND ENGLAND

When Col. Burke was mustered out of service at the close of the Civil War he reported to John O'Mahoney, Head Centre of the Fenian Brotherhood, for service in Ireland; and after a few months delay in New York, during which he worked as a book-keeper in a publishing house, his services were accepted and he sailed for Ireland and reported to Col. Thomas J. Kelly, then acting as Chief of Staff of James Stephens, the Chief Executive of the Irish Republican Brotherhood.

On account of his acquaintance with him in Fenian circles in the United States army Col. Kelly recommended Col. Burke to James Stephens as the best man to act as agent for the organization in England for the purchase of arms. Col. Burke proceeded to England immediately and made contracts for the purchase of arms to

* These two officers were those mentioned in the Manchester Rescue.

be used in the proposed Fenian rising in Ireland in an effort to throw off the British yoke; but lack of money in the organization impaired his activities in that direction.

As Fenian activities were not progressing as well as might be expected in Ireland in 1866, Col. Burke returned to New York during the summer of that year and held conferences with the men in the United States in charge of the movement for the liberation of Ireland from British rule; and arrangements were made for the renewal of activities in Ireland early in 1867.

During the winter of 1866-7 American officers in sympathy with the cause of Irish freedom, who had been mustered out of service after the Civil War, were going to Ireland in small groups to be in readiness in 1867, when the Fenian leaders had determined to make a final effort to liberate Ireland from British oppression.

The plans were made primarily by Gen. William G. Halpin, Col. Thomas J. Kelly and Col. Ricard O'Sullivan Burke, and were feasible and practicable, but were disarranged by a premature attack made under the direction of Capt. McCaffery on his own responsibility, on Chester Castle, a month before the date set for the Irish insurrection on March 5, 1867. This raid was intended to secure arms for the Irish in the proposed fight; and the success of the enterprise was frustrated by the informer John J. Corydon, who divulged to the British government the plans for the capture of Chester Castle.

Col. Burke was assigned to take charge of the men of Waterford in the rising, but the organization was practically broken up in that locality on account of the information given to the government by Corydon, and only a few men could be induced to turn out and take the risk involved in such an enterprise. The proposed insurrection was a failure and the men who were expected to execute the enterprise were dispersed, as their leaders saw the futility of any attempt of that kind at that time with the British government in possession of their plans.

After the movement had failed to materialize Col. Burke, Col. Thomas J. Kelly, Capt. Timothy Deasy, Capt. Michael O'Rourke and other officers went to England and proceeded to reorganize the Fenian movement in that country, and in August a convention of about 300 delegates was held and the plans were laid for a permanent organization. In the following month two of these gentlemen were arrested, and then followed another chapter of interesting history in which Col. Ricard O'Sullivan Burke took an active and leading part.

One of the histories written at that time gives the following account of that incident:

"Early before daybreak on the morning of September 11, 1867, the policeman on duty at Oak street, Manchester, noticed four broad shouldered, muscular men loitering in a suspicious manner about the shop of a clothes dealer in the neighborhood. Their arrest was attempted. A struggle ensued in which two of the suspects succeeded in escaping, but the remaining pair, after offering a determined resistance, were overpowered and carried off to the police station."

Col. Burke was one of the "broad-shouldered, muscular men" who escaped, and Col. Thomas J. Kelly and Capt. Timothy Deasy were the two who were captured, and whose forcible release afterwards from the custody of the English police at Manchester, England, constitutes what in history is known as the "Manchester Rescue."

"THE MANCHESTER RESCUE"

After their arrest Col. Kelly and Capt. Deasy were confined in Salford jail. They were taken to the Courthouse in Manchester for a preliminary hearing, and identified by the British police inspector as Fenian leaders and at his request again remanded to jail to await trial for conspiring to levy war against the British government. Their Fenian comrades, led by Col. Ricard O'Sullivan Burke, determined to rescue them from the hands of the English authorities; and as the prison van in which they were confined with four other prisoners was passing under the railroad bridge half way between the court house and the jail, thirty or more men jumped from behind the fence and ordered the driver to halt. Word had been received by the British authorities that some such movement was on foot, and they had quadrupled the guard, having placed five policemen on the prison van in front, two in the rear, and four in a cab following the van to guard against any attempt at rescue. However, the project was so bold, the enterprise so unusual and the participants so determined that the police guard fled in terror.

Sergeant Charles Brett, who was inside the van in charge of the prisoners, was directed by the rescuers to hand over the keys, but he refused; and several attempts were made to break open the prison van and release the prisoners, but in vain. Finally one of the rescuers fired a shot through the lock in order to break it, and Sergeant Brett, who happened to have his head near the door at the time, was shot and soon after died of his wound. One of the other prisoners handed out the keys and the door was opened and Col.

Kelly and Capt. Deasy, who had been securely handcuffed in the van, were liberated and handed over to their friends who spirited them away; and British police authorities never received any information relative to the whereabouts of these prisoners afterwards so loyal and secretive were the members of the Fenian Brotherhood and their friends and sympathizers in their cause.

THE MANCHESTER MARTYRS

William Philip Allen, Michael Larkin and Michael O'Brien, Edward O'Meagher Condon, and a man named Maguire were afterwards arrested, tried and convicted of murder for participation in the rescue of the two Irish-American officers resulting in the death of Sergeant Brett; and O'Meagher Condon's sentence was commuted, Maguire, who was shown to have been at Liverpool at the time of the rescue, was pardoned, and the other three were hanged on November 23, 1867, to satiate British thirst for Irish blood, and are known in history as "The Manchester Martyrs."

Upon leaving the dock after their trial and sentence they all shouted "God Save Ireland;" and an Irish poet wrote the song of that title which has since become the national anthem of Ireland.

The writer has a letter written by his sister in a convent in Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, in 1890, in which she states that a man whose name she gave as Maguire (but that was not his real name), had died in the hospital there, and after making his peace with God, openly confessed to her and the clergyman and some others present that it was he who had fired the fatal shot through the lock in the door of the prison van in Manchester. This letter was shown to Col. Ricard O'Sullivan Burke soon after it was received, and he stated that it would not be judicious for him at that time to comment on its contents. At that time the writer penned these lines:

**For a deed that these men never helped to commit,
But she hanged them in anger and malice, to-wit,
To avenge her foul wrath and hold Ireland in crepe,
While the slayer to Australia had made his escape!

"ERIN'S HOPE"

As part of the project to aid in the insurrection in Ireland in 1867, a vessel named the *Jackmel* was procured and 8,000 rifles and upwards of a million rounds of ammunition were placed on board; and forty officers who had gained experience in the Civil War embarked thereon for active work in Ireland. The vessel sailed from

New York April 12, 1867, under command of Captain Cavanaugh, and reached Sligo Bay on May 20, 1867, where it was boarded by Col. Burke, who informed the captain that the insurrection had failed and there was no further use in Ireland for the men or arms. The captain sailed his vessel half ways around Ireland and landed thirty of his men at Helvie Head near Dungarvan, County Waterford; and evading all British cruisers he took his vessel safely back to New York and delivered his cargo to the Fenian organization there.

While Col. Burke was waiting in Ireland for the arrival of the *Jackmel*, which the passengers and captain had rechristened "Erin's Hope" while on the high seas, and hoisted the Irish republican tri-color, he spent his time among the resident gentry in Ireland as an amiable gentleman of leisure traveling for pleasure. His striking appearance, gentlemanly demeanor and charming personality aided him materially in carrying out the role which he had assumed; and he dined with the gentry at their request, hunted on their grounds, fished in their preserves and captivated three or more of the resident magistrates who were among those who extended to him invitations to dine and hunt and fish and enjoy life with them. He went so far as to make dinner engagements inviting them to dine with him, but made the dates so far distant that he expected to be out of the country before the appointed day.

At the trial of Augustine E. Costello and John Warren afterwards, from the testimony of a man named Buckley, who was aboard the *Jackmel*, the magistrates discovered the identity of their genial guest as Col. Burke, the leader of the Fenian organization. Of course, the Colonel did not wait to become genial host to his former hosts but went into hiding until he could safely leave the country and return to the United States.

ARREST, TRIAL AND CONVICTION

While organizing the Fenian organization in England Col. Burke boarded with an English lady who had two children, a girl aged about 12 years and a boy aged nine. When Col. Burke was arrested the police authorities were anxious to identify him as the man who had boarded in this house. During his stay in the house of this lady he had taught French to the children and all three were very much attached to him. When this lady was brought in to identify Col. Burke she looked squarely at him and immediately stated that he was "a stranger to her." Then the girl was taken to the cell to identify

him, and she went into hysterics and would not commit herself on the subject. When the boy was brought in he screamed "I don't know him! I don't know him! I don't know him!" and he could not be induced to depart from this statement.

Col. Burke told the writer of this article of another experience which he had during the time that the English police were looking for him before his arrest on November 20, 1867. He had to seclude himself in Manchester or the vicinity, and he was well acquainted with the wife of an inspector of police who was very favorably inclined towards the Fenians, as she was an Irish lady and naturally had Irish sympathies. He conceived the idea that the house of this inspector was the last place in Manchester where the police officials would be likely to look for him, so he made arrangements with the wife of the inspector to secrete him in her home, when the authorities were making renewed and repeated efforts to locate his hiding place.

Finally suspicion was aroused and over the protests of the inspector the authorities determined to search his house. Col. Burke learned from the inspector's wife the time of the proposed search, and she determined to find some place for his concealment. There was a large tank on the roof of the building filled with water for use in case of fire; and into this tank Col. Burke was directed to go and he remained there up to his neck in water while the police were searching the inspector's house over the vehement protests of the inspector and his wife. Of course the Colonel was not found in the house, although a complete and thorough search was made of every room. The Colonel took great delight in telling of incidents like this in his experience while evading the British police authorities. After the police had finished their fruitless search and left the house the inspector's wife furnished some hot coffee and other liquid stimulants and revived the spirits of the Colonel after his enforced cold bath in the water tank.

He was arrested on November 20, 1867, and taken to London for trial and taken to the House of Detention at Clerkenwell, where an attempt was made by the London Fenians on December 13, 1867, to rescue him from prison. A British spy who had worked himself into the confidence of the men engaged in this enterprise was responsible for the premature explosion at Clerkenwell, which killed 12 and wounded 120 people. The proposition was to blow a hole in the wall separating the exercise yard from the street during the time that Col. Burke would be exercising there and thus give him a chance to escape; but fortunately for him he was not in the yard at the time of the explosion and thus escaped injury.

He was tried in London on the charge of purchasing arms in England for the Fenians, was convicted and sentenced to fifteen years penal servitude. Although the government officials believed that he was responsible for planning the Clerkenwell explosion, they had no evidence to that effect; yet, their treatment of him during his confinement in prison showed that they believed him guilty.

While he was in Chatham prison in 1869 the prison doctor made an attempt to kill him by placing poison in his food; but he discovered it in time to thwart the attempt, and in order to escape from the ministrations of the doctor he feigned insanity and thus induced the officials to remove him to the Broadmoor Convict Lunatic Asylum. Among his fellow prisoners at Chatham were Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa, Gen. William G. Halpin, Charles Underwood O'Connell, Capt. John McClure, John Devoy and Harry S. Mulleda.

Under the treatment of Dr. Burns, the prison physician who was administering this poison to him, Col. Burke recognized the symptoms, and having vomited the food which he had taken, he gave the stuff to the prison chaplain, Father Sullivan (cousin of T. D. Sullivan), to take to a chemist and have same analyzed without informing him what it was or what his purpose was in having the test made. The analysis showed conclusively the presence of a dose of poison, and Father Sullivan so reported to Col. Burke. Immediately Col. Burke feigned insanity, and succeeded so well in his pretense that his own comrades of the Fenian Brotherhood believed him insane until he afterwards explained to them the reasons for his pretense of insanity.

A royal commission of inquiry was afterwards organized to inquire into the treatment accorded the Fenian prisoners, and the animus of the prison officials was shown towards Col. Burke by the findings of this commission. The commission consisted of the Earl of Devon, Chairman; a Mr. Broderick, afterwards Secretary of State for War; Dr. Greenhow, an eminent London physician, and Dr. Lyons of Cork. The commission sat at Chatham, Portland and Woking where the Fenian prisoners were confined; and before this commission Dr. Burns testified that "Burke was the cleverest of all the Fenians, but his cleverness was that of a devil."

SUBSEQUENT CIVIL LIFE

Col. Burke was released from prison in 1872 and returned to Ireland, where he lived with a brother at Coachford, County Cork, for two years to recuperate his health which had been shattered during his imprisonment; after which he again came to the United States and for some time lectured in the Eastern States. He secured a posi-

tion as clerk in the War Department at Washington through the influence of Adjutant General Drum, who was an old friend and acquaintance during his period of service in the army. Upon his arrival in Washington he joined the Clan na Gael and continued an active and loyal member of that organization until his death.

In 1880 he took the stump for Garfield and during this campaign he met his wife at Fort Wayne, Indiana, and eloped with her to Washington, where they were married.

After the Garfield campaign he resigned his position, left Washington and went to Mexico in the employ of the Mexican National Construction Company and engineered the project of building a railroad from Laredo, via Monterey, to Mexico City.

After his return from Mexico he secured a position in Omaha, Nebraska, as Assistant City Engineer, which he held until 1884, when he obtained a position in the Map Department in the City of Chicago, and afterwards became Assistant City Engineer in 1887. He held this position until 1892 when he was appointed Superintendent of Sewers, which position he resigned in 1901 when he was appointed Assistant Harbor Engineer and served in that capacity until he became stricken with paralysis five years prior to his death.

THE REMNANT OF THE REBELS

Col. Burke was the last of the Fenians of 1867 who participated in the Fenian rising who resided in Chicago. There are only a few more of them living at present. Liam O'Callaghan, who was sworn into the Fenian organization in 1861 at Macroom, County Cork, Ireland, by Peter O'Riordan, still resides in Joliet, Illinois. He is now over 80 years of age. Dr. Carroll, who was connected with the movement as Sergeant Major, still resides in Philadelphia. He is near 90 years of age. John J. Cuniff, who was James Stephen's Secretary, resides in San Francisco; and George Sweeney resides in Cincinnati. John Devoy, editor of the *Gaelic American* of New York, who was sworn into the Fenian organization in 1861, and still retains his membership, wields a facile pen against the British government that held him in durance vile for five years for his activities in 1865 in swearing into the Fenian organization hundreds of the soldiers of the British army, and succeeded in creating mutiny in many regiments.

OBSEQUIES

After such a strenuous life the end came peacefully to Col. Burke at his home, 6311 North Paulina street, Chicago, on Thursday, May 11, 1922, and from that date until May 15, 1922 when his remains were

borne to Mount Olivet for interment, many of his old friends and acquaintances called at his home to pay their last respect to the Fenian veteran and American soldier and patriot. The funeral was held from St. Gertrude's Catholic Church, where Requiem High Mass was celebrated by the pastor, Rev. Bernard C. Heney. Rev. James M. Scanlon, pastor of our Lady of Lourdes, was deacon; Rev. Michael F. Kennealy, sub-deacon, and Rev. Francis X. McCabe, former President of De Paul University, Chicago, now of Kansas City, came to preach the funeral sermon. In the sanctuary were Right Rev. Thomas L. O'Reilly, Bishop of Lincoln, Nebraska; Rev. Edmund Byrnes, pastor of St. Sebastian's Church, Chicago, and Rev. Michael O'Sullivan, pastor of St. Brigid's Church, Chicago.

The active pall-bearers were Eugene F. O'Riordan, Dr. John M. Murphy, John E. Long, Capt. John D. McCarthy, David P. Murphy, John E. Sheridan, John J. Mahoney and Charles Callanan. The honorary pall-bearers were John Devoy of New York, Hon. Edward F. Dunne, ex-Governor of Illinois; Hon. Kiekham Scanlan, Chief Justice of the Criminal Court; Hon. Daniel Ryan, President Cook County Board; Hon. Joseph P. Mahoney, David Herlihy, Dr. Alexander Pope, Capt. William J. Grace, Maj. Jeremiah S. Hyland, Capt. P. J. Gibbons, Hon. Patrick H. O'Donnell, Richard W. Wolfe, Hugh O'Neill, P. T. O'Sullivan, Daniel J. McMahon, Luke Colleran, John H. Harrington, Lieut. M. W. Delaney, National Director Ancient Order of Hibernians; Michael English, Thomas P. Bonfield, Daniel Donahoe, Martin Fleming, John Doody, John A. McGarry, and others.

As the coffin bearing the mortal remains of Col. Burke was taken from his home for burial, it was draped with the Stars and Stripes of the United States, under which he had fought for four years, and with the Green, White and Orange of the Irish Republic, which he had loved second only to the flag of his adopted country. The sidewalks and street in front of the house were lined with friends and acquaintances and active workers in the cause of Irish liberty, who had come to pay their last respects to their fallen comrade, who, as expressed in the text taken by Rev. Francis X. McCabe for his funeral sermon, "had fought the good fight; had kept the faith; and now I know there is laid up for me the crown which the Just Judge will give to me in that day." At the grave Rev. James M. Scanlon officiated and as the coffin was lowered into its final resting place the great crowd knelt and offered the last prayers for the dead.

In a nearby grave lies the remains of John T. Keating, an old friend of Col. Burke, and to this Father Scanlon led the mourners at the funeral and all knelt and offered a prayer for his soul. On Sunday

night before the funeral about a dozen present, who could speak and understand the Irish language, recited the Rosary in Irish, led by Matthew Harford, who read the prayers from an Irish prayer book; and those present joined in the responses in Irish.

Col. Burke leaves surviving him his widow, Nora Burke, and his daughter, Nellie Burke, who fondly nursed and carefully nourished him during his five years of sickness and partial paralysis. The aged veteran, who fought for the Union for four years during the Civil war, outwitted the British officials for months in their efforts to capture and punish him for his Fenian activities, and finally suffered five years' imprisonment in British dungeons for his Fenian operations against British rule in Ireland, and feigned lunacy in order to circumvent the efforts of the prison officials who endeavored to destroy him by administering poison in his food, presented a pathetic appearance during these five years of suffering and patient endurance in that bed of sickness awaiting the final summons. His valor in the field of action in defence of the liberties of his adopted country, his efficiency in the line of his duties in civil life, his devotion to the land of his birth, his loyalty to his comrades and his great desire to see his native land liberated from British rule and established into an independent republic, free from alien interference, and his patience and fortitude displayed during his long illness, exemplify the grandeur of his character, and his life stands forth as a light to all lovers of human liberty, assuring them that loyalty to a great cause and to his fellow-men—next to his love of God—is the bright gem in the diadem that may adorn the brow of a great citizen, a patriot, a soldier, a comrade and a friend; for such was that Fenian veteran and Union Army Engineer, Col. Ricard O'Sullivan Burke.

EUGENE F. O'RIORDAN.

Chicago.

Illinois Catholic Historical Society

617 ASHLAND BLOCK, CHICAGO

HONORARY PRESIDENTS

Most Rev. George William Mundelein, D. D., *Chicago*
Rt. Rev. James Ryan, D. D., *Alton* Rt. Rev. Edmund M. Dunne, D. D., *Peoria*
Rt. Rev. Peter J. Muldoon, D. D., *Rockford* Rt. Rev. Henry Althoff, D. D., *Belleville*

OFFICERS

PRESIDENT	FINANCIAL SECRETARY
Rev. Frederic Siedenburg, S. J., <i>Chicago</i>	Marie Sheahan, <i>Chicago</i>
FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT	FIRST RECORDING SECRETARY
Edward Osgood Brown, <i>Chicago</i>	Margaret Madden, <i>Chicago</i>
SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT	SECOND RECORDING SECRETARY
James M. Graham, <i>Springfield</i>	Helen Troesch, <i>Springfield</i>
TREASURER	ARCHIVIST
John P. V. Murphy, <i>Chicago</i>	Rev. A. J. Wolfgarten, <i>Chicago</i>

TRUSTEES

Rt. Rev. Daniel J. Riordan, <i>Chicago</i>	Michael F. Girten, <i>Chicago</i>
Very Rev. James Shannon, <i>Peoria</i>	James A. Bray, <i>Joliet</i>
Very Rev. William H. Agnew, S. J.	Frank J. Seng, <i>Wilmette</i>
Rev. John Webster Melody, <i>Chicago</i>	William F. Ryan, <i>Chicago</i>
Mrs. Daniel V. Gallery, <i>Chicago</i>	William N. Brown, <i>Oak Park</i>

Illinois Catholic Historical Review

Journal of the Illinois Catholic Historical Society

917 ASHLAND BLOCK, CHICAGO

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Joseph J. Thompson.....*Chicago*

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Rev. Frederick Beuckman..... <i>Belleville</i>	Kate Meade..... <i>Chicago</i>
Rev. J. B. Culemans..... <i>Moline</i>	Rev. Francis J. Epstein..... <i>Chicago</i>
William Stetson Merrill..... <i>Chicago</i>	

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Poisoning the Wells. Hon. James M. Graham, formerly of the House of Representatives of the United States, representing the Springfield-Illinois district, and one of the most distinguished lawyers in the West, as well as a leading American Catholic (Mr. Graham is First Vice President of the Illinois Catholic Historical Society), delivered an address at the tomb of Abraham Lincoln, in Springfield, Illinois, on July 4th of the present year, in which he forcefully discussed the subject of distortion of American history, particularly with respect to books which are being published for sale to public school boards, many of which are in use in the public schools. He also traced what has the appearance of a concerted movement to distort American history in magazines and other periodicals and the moving pictures. Mr. Graham is no radical or alarmist and yields to none in loyalty to the interests and institutions of the United States. A long life (he is now past sixty), untarnished by even the slightest breach of the duties and obligations of citizenship and resplendent of civic loyalty and devotion,

as well as an unspotted private life, has earned him the right to face the world and to have his convictions respected. Mr. Graham has shown beyond doubt a simultaneous movement, originating in different parts of the country, to discredit the early United States and the moving characters in the establishment of the United States, and to exalt Great Britain and the British. Whether this movement is the result of inspiration, conspiracy or venality, Mr. Graham does not claim to be able to determine, but he does state facts from which it is possible to conclude that the work is the result of some concerted action, with the appearance of having its origin with Englishmen or English sympathizers. That the propaganda of which Mr. Graham complains happens to have a British aspect is not of so much importance as that it should be used at all. It would be just as bad and no worse if it were German propaganda, or French propaganda, or Spanish, or that relating to any other nation or people. There is no merit in the view apparently held by some that it is in the interest of peace and concord that all past unpleasantness between peoples be forgotten. If that were so, a large part of the Bible ought to be eliminated, and all of the differences between the various tribes and nationalities obliterated. The evils as well as the virtues of peoples stand out as lessons to future generations, and a more perfect knowledge of history will make it easier to establish better relations along just lines. Who will deny that the easiest way for the German people, for example, to rehabilitate themselves in the graces and friendship of other nations, would be frankly to acknowledge their faults in connection with the great World war, and give assurances that it was their intention to avoid such a course in the future. In like manner, many distinguished public men in Great Britain understand that no progress toward pleasant relations between Great Britain and the United States can ever be made on any other assumption than that the British government was at fault in dealing with the colonies and the United States government prior to the Revolutionary war and until after the war of 1812. Accordingly, as Mr. Graham aptly said "any attempt (to distort facts in favor of Great Britain and against the United States), is a very sure way to interrupt peace between the two countries." We have reproduced Mr. Graham's address in full in this number and take pleasure in assuring our readers that it will well repay their persusal.

The First Families. References to the "first families," "the earliest citizens," the "first white child," etc., are numerous, especially in newspaper accounts. It is a notable fact, however, that information regarding the real first families, the earliest dwellers, and the first offspring is exceedingly scarce and inaccessible. When one stops to reflect it strikes him as strange that there is not a greater interest manifested in the natives and real first residents and possessors of our fair land,—the Indians. In plain words, what excuse is there for the lack of general information regarding the Indians. A few people have written, some of them extensively, on the subject, but their productions have been mere generalities;—the Indian did this, and did that. There were different families, and different tribes, but no one gets down to details and tells us when and where the Indian did anything in particular or what family or tribe of Indians occupied any particular territory, or who were the Indians, at least their chiefs and leading men. Hidden in unexpected corners of thousands of volumes may be found stray references to this, that or the other tribe or chief, but there has been no intelligent and connected account of the tens of thousands of red men who inhabited the territory now included within the boundaries of the state of Illinois.

We think it high time that some effective effort should be made to trace minutely the race to which we owe so much; indeed, all that we have of landed possessions, and make them known to the present and future generations.

The Marquette Anniversaries. Every day brings us closer to the 250th anniversary of Father Marquette's voyages and sojourns in Illinois. The saintly missionary first passed through Illinois during the months of August and September, 1673. The 250th anniversary of this journey will occur in the months of August and September, 1923, virtually one year distant. The only observance of this anniversary so far planned is that by the State Council of the Knights of Columbus, which will be held in Quincy in the early part of August, 1923. It does seem that there should be a state-wide observance of this momentous event. The next occurrence of first-class importance in connection with Father Marquette's appearance in Illinois was his landing from Lake Michigan on his second journey on December 4, 1674. This landing was effected at the mouth of the Chicago river, which was then located at what is now the east end of Madison street, Chicago. After remaining at the mouth of the river for several days Father Marquette passed up the main river and the south branch to what is now the junction of Robey street and the drainage canal, and lived in a cabin there until March 29 of the following year. This was the first time a white man sojourned in Chicago. During his stay the first Christian ministrations ever known to have taken place were enacted. The personnel, the occasion, and the conduct of this first white man all were of the highest and worthiest. The 250th anniversary of Marquette's landing at Chicago will occur on the 4th of December, 1924, a little more than two years from the present time. The Illinois Catholic Historical Society has adopted resolutions looking to the proper observance of this anniversary, and the rearing of a monument or memorial in honor and memory of the great event. The climax of Father Marquette's relations with Illinois occurred on the 11th of April, 1675, nothing less than the establishment of the Church in Illinois, and for the Illinois country, at what is now Utica, in La Salle County. The 250th anniversary of this stupendous event will occur on April 11, 1925. Nothing has yet been done in preparation for proper observance of this notable anniversary. Will the people of Illinois, and the Catholics especially, permit any of these anniversaries to pass without due observance?

The Earliest Missions. What was the most active center of Catholicity in the infancy of the Church in the United States? Should the perambulating reporter put that question to ten persons each day for a year, even were the persons approached Catholics, we believe that nine out of ten of them would say California. Some might say Florida, a few might mention Maryland, but it is doubtful if any could be found, unless some one who had carefully examined the matter, that would name Illinois. And yet it is an easily demonstrable fact that Illinois was practically the only early Church center in territory that became the United States that remained permanent; and so far as volume of activity is concerned surpassed all other early centers within that territory incomparably. True there were missions which antedated those of Illinois. Missionaries came to Florida in 1565; the missions overflowed into Maine from Canada before 1650; missionary endeavor begun in Maryland in 1634; the first missionaries came into California in 1683. As for Illinois, Father Marquette first visited the Illinois

country in 1673, and formally established the Church on the site of the present City of Utica on April 11, 1675. Considered from the standpoint of continuity it appears that the missions in Maine, Maryland and even in California were broken up or so interrupted as to virtually nullify their results within short periods after their establishment. Not so with the Illinois missions, which, from the date of their founding by Marquette in 1675, continued without a single break, and with only a very few temporary interruptions, from their founding to the present time. A full century and more of continuous missionary endeavor is properly accredited to the Illinois Church prior to the Revolutionary war. Nothing comparable with that may be said of any other mission in the United States. As for results, the statistics of baptisms amongst the savages contained in the letters of the Illinois missionaries overwhelmingly outnumber those shown in the records of any other of the United States missions. In like manner there have been nowhere outside of the reductions of South America and Mexico early settlements of civilized Indians at all comparable with Lavantum (the first Kaskaskia on the present site of Utica), or about Peoria lake, or about the later Kaskaskia on the river of that name in the present Randolph county. Then why should the impression prevail that Maine, California, Florida or Maryland was a more active Catholic center than Illinois? The answer is that these have had a wider hearing. Greater publicity in this country has always been accorded Eastern occurrences of every character, which accounts for the greater popularity of the Eastern missions. As for California the ruins or the remains of the mission Churches are and have been visible proofs of missionary activity, and have created a more vivid and more general impression than that given by the written and largely inaccessible record of missionary endeavor in Illinois. It is a matter of some satisfaction that the *Illinois Catholic Historical Society*, aided and sustained by other Catholic societies and generous individual Catholics, is making known through the columns of the ILLINOIS CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW and otherwise the glorious missionary history of Illinois.

Adopting a Constitution. Touching upon a question of current history, viz., the struggle for the adoption of a constitution by what is known as the parliament of the free state of Ireland, and aware that the deliberations of the Dail Errain would become a part of world history, it is interesting to note that a much greater contest occurred over the adoption of the constitution of the United States. The great struggle for the adoption of the American constitution has been forcefully and interestingly brought to our minds through the monumental work of Senator Beveridge of Indiana, treating of the life and times of Chief Justice John Marshall. An address delivered at the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg, Va., in January of this year, by former Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of New York, Alton B. Parker, has also pointedly detailed this contest. After reciting the manner of formulation of the constitution Mr. Parker in his address tells of the struggle to have the constitution ratified by the several states. Without a familiarity with conditions as they then existed, it is difficult for us to understand why the great patriot, Patrick Henry, to whose eloquence, largely, we owe our independence, should be the chief opponent of the constitution. Thinking in parallels the attitude of Patrick Henry then resembles the attitude of Eamon de Valera now. Speaking of Henry's opposition Parker says: "Patrick Henry, with his great eloquence, known to every school boy of the land

from that day to this, was the leader in the mighty struggle against ratification. Edmund Randolph, then the governor of Virginia, and afterwards President Washington's first attorney general, a most popular man and an eloquent debater, was the flower of the speaking force favoring ratification." The chief struggle occurred in Virginia. Senator Beveridge says that "while the defense of the constitution had been very able in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, and later in New York was to be most brilliant, the attack upon it in the Virginia convention was nowhere equalled or approached in power, learning and dignity. Extravagant as the assertion appears, it nevertheless is true that the Virginia contest was the only real debate over the whole constitution. It far surpassed, especially in presenting the reasons against the constitution, the discussion of the Federal convention itself, in weight of argument and attractiveness of presentation, as well as in the ability of the debaters." Mr. Parker points with pride to the success attained under the constitution, showing how admirably it is adapted both to peace and war, and approves the declaration of Gladstone to the effect that the constitution of the United States is "the greatest work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." Every work of human minds or hands has its faults and imperfections, and the constitution of the United States is of course no exception, but while it represents the accumulated wisdom and best intent of the people who are the makers of the constitution, it is amenable to alteration by the people in order that faults may be corrected and defects eliminated. In the meantime men of good judgment agree with Mr. Parker when he says that the Federal constitution is "the pride of every intelligent and patriotic American," and an admirable vehicle of administration or governmental agency for sustaining all those who desire the right and the holding in check or punishing those who would do wrong.

Annual Meeting.—The fifth annual meeting of the Illinois Catholic Historical Society will be held in the Assembly Hall of the Quigley Memorial Seminary Monday, December 11, 1922, at 8 p. m. Most Rev. Archbishop Mundelein, Right Rev. Edward F. Hoban and other prominent priests and laymen will be present and participate. Everybody wishing to attend will be welcome.

BOOK REVIEWS

First National Third Order Convention, U. S. A. Published by order of the general directive Board, Edited by Father Hilorian Duerk, O. F. M.

The comprehensive report of the First National Third Order Convention, U. S. A., published under that title, is a volume of nearly 1,000 pages, but by no means unwieldy or inconvenient. It is much more, however, than an ordinary formal report of an important meeting, for it not only gives in more or less detail the history and development of the Third Order of St. Francis, but makes the reader acquainted with the great representatives of the order, past and present.

There are no doubt many who know absolutely nothing of the Third Order, and this statement from the eloquent address of Rev. Father Bede Hess, O. M. C., of Trenton, N. J., on the subject of the Third Order and the Lay-Apostolate will be interesting:

“With its spirit of individual and social reform it enters all classes of society. Men and women, youths and maidens, boys and girls fourteen years or over, the rich and the poor, the cultured and the uncultured, the professor and his scholar, the employer and his employe, the priest and the Faithful, the superior and the subordinate, all may and should be enrolled in its membership and girded with the penitential cord of the St. Assisi. It is all-comprehensive, and reaches every class-distinction of human society. By its self same rule of life for all it preaches the gospel of true equality of all men before God, before the God-Man, before the Church of God and before the tribunal of conscience. It teaches most emphatically that before these there are no class privileges. It is, therefore, ‘the brotherhood of men under one God, their Father,’ which is the motive of the lay-apostolate.” (page 448)

The First National Third Order Convention, U. S. A., was held in Chicago October 2, 3, 4, 1921.

A very large number of people took part in this meeting and made many speeches or preached sermons all upon one theme, the Third Order. One would naturally suppose that a three-day program of that character would grow prosy, but a reading of the book will disclose that the interest grew as the time lengthened.

Quotations from the programs of two sessions will readily indicate why the proceedings held the interest. Here is what occurred on Sunday afternoon, October 2: Opening address, Hon. Anthony Matre, K. S. G.; Address of Welcome, Most Rev. George W. Mun-

delein, D. D.; *The Tertiary Centenary*, Most Rev. Edward J. Hanna, D. D.; *United Tertiary Effort*, Hon. W. Bourke Cochran, K. C. G.

And here is the program that was presented at the "Men's Meeting," Monday afternoon, October 3. After the presentation of the question of *The Divorce Evil*, by Bishop Byrne, and a general discussion, *Socialism and the Third Order* was presented by David Goldstein; *The Social Influence of the Third Order*, by Dr. Felix Gauden; *The Missionary Spirit of St. Francis*, Hon. Joseph Scott; *Francis of Assisi, Saint and Poet*, by Hon. Maurice Francis Egan, LL. D.; *The Historical Background of the Third Order*, by Dr. James J. Walsh.

These addresses as well as all other proceedings of the convention are printed in full in the book, and we do not hesitate to state that a single one of them is worth the price of the book.

A reading of this book (we have read it with great pleasure) shows that it is the belief of the clergy and laity, shared by the hierarchy, that the Third Order of St. Francis should be made better known. And we are convinced that if it were known as described in this convention, or even half of what may be said of it were generally known, thousands of devout Catholics would seek to enroll themselves. Anyone who wants to know about the Third Order of St. Francis should read this publication.

The Jesuits, 1534-1921. A History of the Society of Jesus from its Foundation to the Present Time. By Rev. Thomas J. Campbell, S. J., The Encyclopedia Press, New York.

In his volume, "The Jesuits," Rev. Thomas J. Campbell, S. J., has scored a success. The writer's difficult problem was to condense the 400 years' history of the large and active Order of the Jesuits into a single uncrowded volume, printed in readable type, and free from prolixity.

People having no acquaintance with the Order can hardly realize that so many important events in the world's history have centered around or been closely related to the Jesuits. The central purposes of the Order—education and missionary work—brought them in contact, and repeatedly, in conflict, with all peoples and institutions in any degree opposed to Christian doctrines or to the Catholic Church. They were no more stubbornly opposed by charlatans and manitous of savage races than they were by the corrupt and venal amongst the civilized. Often their opponents in the civilized ranks falsely and fraudulently based their opposition on the pretense of fidelity to the Church, and under the guise of protection to the Church won more or

less support in their opposition from the indiscriminating. Such were Ponbal, Choiseul, Charles III of Spain,—Squillace, Florida Blanca, Aranda, Tannuci Orsmii, Azpura and others, whose nefarious machinations have made their names execrable in the history of states and nations; indeed, no one can read the story of “The Jesuits” or that of the Church itself even, without realizing that the most poignant sorrows and the greatest injuries inflicted upon both the Order and the Church were the results of the treachery and conspiracy of black-hearted masqueraders posing as loyal sons of Holy Mother Church, but in reality vilifiers, traitors and malefactors.

Some respect may be felt for those who stood out boldly and opposed the Church, its teachings, its work and its ministry, including all orders and divisions. Nothing but contempt, however, can be felt for the hypocrites who used their position or influence in the Church for the purposes of deception, the furtherance of private ends, and as an instrumentality of vengeance.

The dark side of the Jesuit picture, as drawn by Father Campbell, reveals numberless martyrdoms, inconceivable suffering, every hardship and privation to which human beings could be subjected, and incomprehensible labors. The bright side exhibits the lives and deeds of a galaxy of consecrated men, such as may be found nowhere else in the history of the world. Ignatius, Xavier, Francis Borgia, Acquaviva, Ricci, Roothan, Bellarmine, Campion, Francis Regis, John Berchmans, John Casimir, Peter Claver, Plowden, Kostka, Jogues, Brebeuf, Marquette, DeSmet and thousands, yes, tens of thousands of other Christian luminaries, intellectual giants, popular champions, master scholars, unexcelled teachers, and, finally, model citizens and men compose the Order.

Throughout its history the Order is to be loved for the enemies it has made. It is only in recent years that we have been enabled to view in perspective the friends and enemies of the Society of Jesus. Time is drawing the contrast, and while the blackest pages of history are themselves disfigured by the men who have ranged themselves in opposition to the Order, the record of every advance, of every benevolence, of every movement in the interest of humanity, of every yearning for better things and heavenly reward is adorned by the names of Jesuits, who are shown to be, if not the prime movers, at least amongst the most effective of the proponents.

Were not Father Campbell so modest in the presentation of his subject, one might be inclined to think that at last the Order had broken away from its traditional policy of silence and seclusion. All down through the ages the great men who guided the destinies of the

Order have insisted upon a policy of silence and non-resistance to calumnies and persecution—hence the blatant could quite generally feel secure in publishing almost any sort of falsehood concerning the Order; and while Father Campbell's book is not a departure from this policy, the naked story which he tells is a concrete refutation of well nigh every slander that has been uttered against the Society.

The average man shuns danger and discomfort. The history of the Society of Jesus proves that the Jesuit seeks them; not that he relishes either better than others, but that he is consecrated to a cause which bids him dare and endure. Accordingly, wherever human beings may be found, all over the habitable globe, there is, or has been, or will be, the Jesuit:—the icy wastes of the extreme arctic, and the burning sands of the equator are alike his fields of endeavor, and wherever the most violent or pestilential of the human family exists there he penetrates, and pawns his health and strength, even his life.

The story of the missions as set down by Father Campbell, without elaboration or ornamentation, is absolutely fascinating. The reader will be surprised that a work of such broad compass and at the same time of such brevity can contain so much of the individual lives and experiences of individual missions and missionaries. Not only is the European field completely covered, but we can follow the author to China, Japan, Hindustan, North and South America, all the islands of the seas, and will find as faithful an account of missionary endeavor in our own country as that of any other.

A work like that of Father Campbell was badly needed, even assuming that none but Jesuits and friends of the Jesuits will ever read it, for it is a fair presumption that few members of the Order even, and perhaps none outside the Order, know the Society as it may be learned from Father Campbell's book.

What is here said is in all respects an unbiased judgment. Any one with an open mind will concede every statement here made, and in so doing need not place the Jesuit Order above other orders, or, in any sense, in conflict or comparison with the Church itself. The Order is one of the agencies of the Church, and is fully entitled to all the credit that has been accorded it, and it is wholly unnecessary to enter upon comparisons. Those who understand and appreciate the situation need only be thankful that such an effective instrumentality as the Order exists, and rejoice that it is not the only effective agency to such ends.

There never was, of course, a perfect book. Volumes of criticism of the Bible even have been written, and the critical will perhaps find inadvertances, and possibly, some errors. One reviewer says that

“the unfortunate part is that Father Campbell seems to have approached his theme too much in the spirit of a cinema playwright.” In other words, is guilty of having made the story too interesting. We think most readers will forgive Father Campbell for that dereliction. The same reviewer finds a few real errors which may easily be inadvertences. We have always regretted that Father Campbell does not use foot note references in his writings. It is true that he usually refers to his authority, especially upon controverted questions in the text. It is also true that documenting is laborious, and besides, adds to the difficulty of the publisher, and perhaps to the expense of publication, but documentation gives a sort of sense of authority and security, and besides introduces the reader to the entire field explored by the author.

It is worthy of note in connection with this noteworthy work, as well as with other undertakings of the sort, which are all too rare, that it is much better to have attempted the work and succeeded as well as has Father Campbell than to stand on the side lines and lament that a perfect work has not been produced, and criticise disparagingly efforts, which are at least worthy, prepared by some one else.

J. J. T.

MISCELLANY

Early Church in Missouri and Illinois

THE DISTINGUISHED BARBER FAMILY.

(A letter from Mgr. Rosati, Bishop of St. Louis, to the Editor of the *Annales*.)

Sir:

I received your letter written last August; the Masses, with which you charged me, will be said by a number of priests. I sent one hundred and fifty to Father Paillasson, and distributed the others to other priests, and will write to the seminary today to have those said, which you sent to Father Odin. You must have already seen the latter, and he without doubt gave you the letters, which I wrote you and also all the details which you desire. I will add a few more here, which will show you the state of my diocese at the end of this year.

We have twenty-one churches, of which sixteen are in the state of Missouri, and five in Illinois; we are now building three of stone; last year we also built three of stone and intend to build five more very soon. In my diocese there are thirty-one parishes of Catholics, twenty, in the state of Missouri, nine in Illinois, and two in Arkansas. Nineteen of these Parishes have Churches; St. Louis has two, consequently eleven have none. Mass is said in private houses where the Catholics assemble. Thirteen of them have resident priests, fourteen received the visits of a priest, one is vacant because I have no one to send them, and four were established last year. There are thirty-six priests including myself; three of us died last year, I ordained two, one of whom was born in this country, the other is French; three of them came to us and four left other dioceses. Twenty-two of these priests are employed in the ministry, sixteen are in the colleges, seminaries and communities, ten are Lazarists; there are eleven Jesuits and fifteen do not belong to any community. I have three priests and eleven clerks at the seminary and two at the college of the Propaganda at Rome.

In my diocese besides the seminary there are two colleges who have the privilege of conferring a degree. That of the Jesuits at St. Louis has about one hundred boarders and sixty day scholars; the Lazarists at Barrones have one hundred and twenty five boarders and very few day scholars being in the country.

There are three communities of men; the Lazarists at Barrones, the Jesuits at St. Louis, and the Jesuits at St. Ferdinand, where they have their noviciate.

There are ten religious communities of women; three of the ladies of the Sacred Heart, four of the Sisters of Loretta, and two of the Sisters of Charity; one of the Sisters of the Visitation; two orphan asylums, one for boys and one for girls and the hospital. In all these different houses, there are sixty nine religious, among whom are twenty-two of the Sacred Heart, twenty-seven of the Sisters of Loretta, twelve of the Sisters of Charity, and eight Religious of the Visitation; twenty orphan boys and twenty-three orphan girls. Three of these Religious houses were founded last year, and three more will be founded this year. Since my return from Baltimore, I gave the habit to four Religious, two of Loretta, one of the Visitation, and one of the Sacred Heart.

The details which I am going to give you about a young woman, who received the habit of Religious of the Visitation at Cascastus, (Kaskaskia)

are very interesting. Her name is Josephine Barber; she is the last of the children of Mr. Virgile Barber and of Jerusha Barber, his wife. Mr. Barber, once an Episcopalian minister, is now a Jesuit and priest; Madam Jerusha Barber, his wife, is now a Religious in the convent in the Visitation of Georgetown. They had five children, four daughters and one son. After the conversion of their parents, all of the children embraced the religious state and Providence allowed them to make an even greater sacrifice in disposing of each individual of this family in a different town; the father at Frederick Town; the mother at George Town, District of Columbia; and of the four daughters, one was at Quebec, the other at Trois-Rivieres in Canada; a third at Boston, Mass., and a fourth at Cascasius, (Kaskaskia) Illinois, and the boy is at Rome where he is a Jesuit.

The story of the conversion of Mr. Barber and his wife is as striking as that of the Christians of the first century of the Church. Very talented and possessing a wonderful education, they led very pure lives, and were sincerely religious. The many sects in the United States often caused them to reflect painfully on this subject and they finished having doubts as to their own religion. Souls as cultivated and intelligent as those of Mr. and Mrs. Barber could not help but understand that truth is one and undivisible, and that consequently the doctrine and the Church of Jesus Christ must have this quality. They redoubled their ardor in trying to learn the truth, and resolved to embrace our doctrine and enter into the Church as soon as they had learned it well. The prejudices of their education and the false representations which have been made against the Church, and which are so often repeated among the Protestants kept them from turning to us. In an interview which Mr. Barber had with his father, who was also a Protestant minister, and who was searching for the truth, they decided to examine the dogmas of the Catholic Church. Mr. Barber told his wife of this, who approved of his plan, and advised him to get in touch with the Catholic priest. With this idea in mind, he went to New York, and had a great many conversations with the worthy administrator of the diocese, who is now a bishop of Boston, Mgr. Fenwick, his prejudices and doubts ceased, and the truth seemed so evident to him, that he resolved to become a Catholic; this he did with his wife without dreaming of the sacrifices which he would be obliged to make. After being a Catholic for some time, he began to wish to lead a more perfect life, and after obtaining the consent of his wife who had the same desire, he entered into the community of the Jesuits; their example was followed after that by all of their children. The old father of Mr. Barber, having himself embraced the Catholic Religion, showed himself worthy of being a patriarch of this family. Being too old to become a priest, he felt honored to receive minor orders, and devote his life to the conversion of others to the Religion. The family of the sister of Mr. Barber had almost the same happiness. Four young women of this family became members of the Sisters of Charity, their oldest brother is a priest in the Diocese of Boston, and two other younger brothers applying themselves to the study for the priesthood.

I will give you news of Father Rioux in another letter; he is at the border of the state among the savages.

I am, etc. JOSEPH, Bishop of St. Louis.

(Annales For the Propagation of Faith,
7th Tome, Page 168.)

106095

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

**PERIODICAL ROOM
COPY**

Illinois Cath. Hist. R.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

Books may be kept for two weeks and may be renewed for the same period, unless reserved.

Two cents a day is charged for each book kept overtime.

If you cannot find what you want, ask the Librarian who will be glad to help you.

The borrower is responsible for books drawn on his card and for all fines accruing on the same.



